ITEM NO:		
2	Location:	**36 Dacre Crescent Kimpton Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 8QJ**
	Applicant:	**Mr And Mrs Dye**
	Proposal:	**Part two, part single storey rear extension and single storey front extension (as amended by drawing RL/4884/36-02B received 12/09/2018).**
	Ref.No:	18/01288/FPH
	Officer:	**Tom Donovan**

Date of expiry of statutory period : 06.07.2018

Reason for Delay (if applicable)

Reason for Referral to Committee (if applicable)

Submitted Plan Nos

RL/4884/36-01 RL/4884/36-02B

1.0 Policies

Date of expiry of statutory period

26th October 2018

Submitted Plan Nos.

RL/4884/36-01; RL/4884/36/02B

Reason for Delay

Extension of time to allow consideration of amended plans.

Reason for Referral to Committee

Councillor John Bishop has 'called-in' the application in support of the objection from Kimpton Parish Council.

1.0 **Site History**

1.1 None relevant.

2.0 **Relevant Planning Policy**

2.1 **North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No.2 with Alterations**

Policy 28 - House Extensions
Policy 55 - Car Parking Standards

2.2 **National Planning Policy Framework.**

Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

2.3 **Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031 (Approved by Full Council 11th April 2017).**

D1 - Sustainable Design
D2 – House extensions, replacement dwellings and outbuildings
D3 – Protecting living conditions
T2 – Parking

2.4 **Supplementary Planning Document**

Vehicle Parking at New Development September 2011

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Public Notice/ local residents**
Letters of objection from local residents:
--Mr and Mrs Dyer, 34 Dacre Crescent
--Mr and Mrs McCullough, 38 Dacre Crescent
--Mr Edwards, 40 Dacre Crescent

The following issues have been brought to my attention by the above parties:
--Loss of sunlight, daylight and heat;
--Extension would be overbearing;
--Poor quality of drawings;

--Loss of views;
--Overlooking/loss of privacy;
--Disruption due to building works;
--Potential impact on drainage/waste/sewage;
--Impact on property values;
--Impact on car parking in the area;
--Design concerns;
--Impact on enjoyment of neighbouring properties and impact on health and safety.

3.2 **Kimpton Parish Council**
Objection due to the impact of the two/single storey element on the living conditions of the neighbouring properties. Other concerns include the impact on car parking and waste provision.

NB. Councillor John Bishop has 'called-in' the application in support of the view of the objection from the Parish Council

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1. 36 Dacre Crescent is a detached two-storey residential property. It is part of a planned estate located beyond the northern-edge of the High Street.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 This development as amended by plan no. RL/4884/36/02B comprises of two items that are fully independent of each other and which can be summarised as follows:
A) Part two, part single storey rear extension.
B) Single storey front extension.

4.2.2 A) Part two, part single storey rear extension
The proposed extension has been amended during the application process from a full two storey extension to a part two, part single storey scheme. The single storey element would extend across the full width of the rear of the house and would project by a distance of m beyond the rear wall of the house main house. The two storey element is proposed to be set within the single storey element and would have a projection of 3m beyond the rear wall of the main house. The two storey element would have a hipped roof with eaves to match the main house and a ridge height set below that of the main roof. A single high-level velux rooflight is proposed for each flank roof-slope.

NB. As a result of the two storey aspect of the proposal, three small obscure-glazed windows are proposed at first floor level (two for the east-facing flank wall, one for the west-facing flank wall). However, these windows would be obscure glazed and top-opening thereby meeting the requirements of Class A.

4.2.3 Single storey front extension
The extension would extend the existing mono-pitched roof front extension and provide a further projecting front porch as a central projection. The projecting front porch would have a pitched roof and would project by 1.5m beyond the existing front extension.

4.2.4 In both cases facing materials are proposed to match those used in the construction of the main house.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:
--The effect on the character and appearance of the area;
--The effect on the living conditions of neighbouring properties;
--The effect on highway safety and car parking.

4.3.2 **Part two storey, part single storey rear extension**
Design and appearance
Saved Policy 28 suggests that a house extension is generally acceptable providing that it is 'sympathetic' to the existing house in design terms. Emerging Policy D2 outlines the same goal although limited weight can be attributed to the content of the Emerging Policy at this stage. Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks good design.

4.3.3 The proposed extension has been reduced in size through negotiation with the applicant whilst the detailed design has also been tweaked in order to reduce its potential impact. Specifically, the first floor element has been reduced both in width and depth and this part of the proposal would now have a maximum depth of 3m which is consistent with the aims of the Saved Policy 28. The single storey element would extend to a depth of 4.5m beyond the rear wall of the main house (and thus 1.5m beyond the rear wall of the first floor element) however it is considered that this would be a proportionate addition. Moreover, one should take account of the fact that a 4m deep single storey rear extension could be constructed by the applicant as 'permitted development' and therefore an extension some half a metre shorter than that proposed would not require a specific planning permission.

4.3.4 As well as being reduced in terms of its width and depth, the roof profile of the proposed first floor element has been changed to a hipped roof whilst the overall form and height of the extension is such that it would appear to be a subservient element. The single storey element would too have a hipped roof and this is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

4.3.5 Ultimately it is considered that the proposed extension would have an acceptable relationship with the host dwelling in terms of its size and design and would thus have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area.

4.3.6 Impact on neighbouring properties
38 Dacre Crescent
This property is also detached and is located to the north-west of the application site. The flank wall of the application property is located approximately 1.8m from the boundary with no.38 whilst the flank wall of no.38 is itself set away from the boundary. It should also be noted that the front wall of no.38 is positioned beyond the front wall of the application property by approximately 2m and thus the rear wall of the application property already projects beyond that of no.38.

4.3.7 The first floor section has been reduced to a depth of 3m which is in line with the Council's policy regarding house extensions whilst the ground floor section would not have such size or prominence that it would cause any material harm. Given the relatively modest depth of the first floor element and the distance between the flank walls of the two properties, I do consider that the proposed extension would cause a material loss of daylight or sunlight to rear windows belonging to this property. Moreover, I am satisfied that the proposed first floor element would not be overbearing given the distances involved and the reduced scale of the extension.

4.3.8 New windows are primarily proposed for the rear face of the extension and would thus face into the rear garden of the application site. However, a single new obscure-glazed window is proposed for the flank wall of the main house and would face towards the boundary with no.38. This window is to be conditioned to be obscure-glazed and top-opening only. A high-level rooflight is proposed for the flank roofslope but this would not enable any overlooking and is acceptable. I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy for no.38.

4.3.9 *34 Dacre Crescent*
This property is located to the south-east of the application site and is also detached. In the opposite arrangement to no.38, this property is actually positioned to the rear of the application property and thus the rear wall of no.34 is approximately 2m beyond the rear wall of the application property. I would estimate that the distance between the flank walls of each property is approximately 1.5m.

4.3.10 Given the layout of the two properties and the reduced extent of the proposed extension I do not consider that the proposed extension would cause any material harm to the living conditions of no.34. Rear windows and thus windows serving principle habitable rooms would not be significantly affected although I note that there is a first floor landing window located on the flank wall of the extension and this is likely to be affected. However, a landing window is not considered to be a primary habitable room and therefore I attribute limited weight to the protection of this window.

4.3.11 New windows are primarily proposed for the rear face of the extension and would thus face into the rear garden of the application site. However, two new obscure-glazed windows are proposed for the flank wall of the main house and would face towards the boundary with no.34. Both of these windows are proposed and conditioned to be obscure-glazed and top-opening only. A high-level rooflight is proposed for the flank roofslope but this would not enable any overlooking and is acceptable. I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy for no.34.

4.3.10 *Others*
I do not consider that any other neighbouring properties would be affected.

4.3.11 Car parking
This aspect of the proposed development would not trigger the requirement for additional car parking to be provided within the application site. The proposal would thus not conflict with the safe operation of the adjacent highway.

4.3.12 **Single storey front extension**
Design and appearance
As introduced in paragraph 4.3.2 of this Committee Report, house extensions are required to be ‘sympathetic’ with the host dwelling.

4.3.13 The proposed front extension would have an acceptable relationship with the host dwelling in terms of its size and design. The central section would extend beyond the mono-pitch roof extension that is being extended across but the projection would not be significant and I do not consider that the extension would cause harm to the character or appearance of the area.

4.3.14 Impact on neighbouring properties
The proposed extension would be modest in size and would not cause any material

harm on the living conditions of any of the neighbouring properties.

4.3.15 Car parking
The front extension would slightly reduce the size of the front driveway whilst the plans indicate that the existing integral garage would be converted. However, it appears to me that the driveway would be able to accommodate a minimum of at least two cars which is the minimum amount of car parking that should be provided for. It should be noted here that the conversion of the garage to a games room would not be a material change of use requiring planning permission and could thus lawfully proceed without permission.

4.3.16 Other matters
Other matters not material to the decision have been raised including the potential disruption due to the build, the impact on drainage and the impact on property values. These are not matters that are able to be attributed any weight in the decision.

4.3.17 Concerns have been expressed that permitting this extension may set a precedent that others in the street may follow. However, each case is to be considered on its merits and therefore I do not consider that this should form the basis of any decision.

4.3.18 Lastly, the quality and accuracy of the drawings has been called into question by some of the interested third parties. However, having visited the site and considered the drawings in some detail I am satisfied that the drawings are indeed accurate and are able to be accurately scaled measured from for the purposes of considering the potential impact of the proposed development..

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 It is considered that the proposed part two storey, part first floor rear extension and the proposed single storey front extension would be sympathetic additions that would have an acceptable impact on the wider character and appearance of the area. Moreover, the proposal would not cause material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties nor would the safe operation of the highway be affected. Accordingly the proposed development would be in accordance with Saved Policies 28 and 55, Emerging Policies D2, D3 and T2, and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4.5 **Alternative options**

4.5.1 None applicable.

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission is **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 windows proposed to be installed at first floor level on the south-east and north-west facing elevations of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass and will be non-opening up to 1.7m from the floor of the room that the windows are located.

   Reason:To safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as amended no development as set out in Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Order, (or any subsequent Statutory Instrument which revokes, amends and/or replaces those provisions) shall be carried out without first obtaining a specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason: Given the nature of this development, the Local Planning Authority considers that development which would normally be "permitted development" should be retained within planning control in the interests of the character and amenities of the area.

5. Construction work carried out in connection with the development hereby approved shall only be between the hours of 8.00am and 18:00pm Monday to Fridays and between 09:00am and 13:00pm on Saturdays. No work shall be undertaken on Sundays or Bank holidays.

   Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

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.