

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Tabitha Kaye.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
26/01336/FPH	Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear element and relocation of existing rear outbuilding.	The White House Newlands Lane Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 9BB
<u>Submitted Plan Nos</u>		
26030 - 003 - Outbuilding	26030 - 001	26030 - 002 26030 - 011 26030 - 012 26030 - 014

1.0 **Policies**

SECN12	Achieving well-designed places
SECN14	Meeting climate change, coastal, flooding
SP9	Design and Sustainability
D1	Sustainable design
D2	House exts, replcmnt dwellings outbuild
D3	Protecting living conditions
HS6	Relatives and dependents accommodation
T2	Parking

2.0 **Relevant Site History**

2.1 **15/01878/1HH:** Replacement single storey timber outbuilding. **Conditional Permission.**

2.2 **06/00082/1HH:** Two storey side and rear extension, single storey side extension and two storey front extension. **Conditional Permission.**

- 2.3 **05/01671/1HH:** Two storey outbuilding to facilitate double garage and WC at ground floor and games room over. **Conditional Permission.**

3.0 **Representations**

- 3.1 **Neighbour Consultation** – No comments received.

- 3.2 **St Ippolyts Parish Council** – No objection.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The application site accommodates a large detached two-storey dwelling situated on a large plot on Newlands Lane, Hitchin. The site is within the Hitchin settlement boundary.
- 4.2.1 Properties along Newlands Lane are characterised by their scale and large plot size. Properties are typically detached and maintain an adequate separation distance from one another due to the size of their respective plots.
- 4.2.3 The White House benefits from a generous front driveway and rear garden. The site is enclosed by high, mature hedging.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear element and relocation of existing rear outbuilding.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- 1.1.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:

- 1.0 Principle of development;
- 2.0 Design and impact on local character;

- 3.0 Impact on neighbour amenity;
- 4.0 Highways and parking matters;
- 5.0 Impact on the environment;
- 6.0 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

Principle of Development

- 1.1.2 The rationale for the proposed extension is to future proof the property for a disabled family member. As such, I consider that Policy HS6 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 (NHLP) lists the criteria for dependents' accommodation. While this use may not be immediate for the applicant, I consider it pertinent to assess the proposal against the requirements of Policy HS6.
- 1.1.3 Policy HS6 states that permission for dependents' accommodation, formed by the adaptation or extension of the main dwelling, will be permitted providing that the proposal conforms with the following criteria:

a) a genuine need for the accommodation is demonstrated – sufficient evidence has been submitted as part of the application to present a genuine need for the accommodation;

b) the annex is subordinate to the main dwelling and designed in such a way that it can be easily (re-)incorporated into the main house if use as an annex ceases – the case for the scale of the extension is discussed in the proceeding section, 'Design and Impact on Local Character'. It is considered that the extension could be easily reincorporated into the main house, should its use as dependents' accommodation cease;

c) any development would not exceed the size of extensions that would otherwise normally be acceptable – this criterion will also be discussed under 'Design and Impact on Local Character';

d) the occupation of the accommodation is restricted by condition – the extension will be conditioned to remain ancillary to the main house.

The scheme's overall compliance with Policy HS6 will be concluded in the proceeding section.

Design and Impact on Local Character

- 1.1.4 Policies D1 and D2 of the North Herts Local Plan (NHLP) require that development proposals respond positively to the site's local context. Policy D2 specifies that extensions to houses should be sympathetic to the main dwelling in terms of scale, form and orientation. These policies are broadly consistent with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 1.1.5 The proposed outbuilding would be of an acceptable scale and design for its positioning within the rear garden of the dwelling. The outbuilding would be well enclosed within the rear garden and would not impact the street character.
- 1.1.6 The scale of the proposed rear extension would be significant, and justification for the size of the extension has been covered in the previous section against Policy HS6. It is important that the extension is contextualised against the size of the host dwelling and the overall plot.
- 1.1.7 The extension would be sited along the north boundary of the site, measuring a maximum of 16.2m in depth and 7.8m in width. There would be a marginal south projection running along rear elevation of the dwelling, measuring 5m in width and 1.6m in depth. The design of the extension would be low-rise, featuring a hipped roof with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 3.5m.
- 1.1.8 It is difficult to claim that the extension would be 'subordinate' on account of the large floor area proposed. However, an extension of this scale would not appear out of place in the context of the substantial size of the dwelling and the plot. While not of the scale proposed, the site benefits from existing built form in this siting (the existing rear extension and detached outbuilding) along the north boundary.
- 1.1.9 Furthermore, I would argue that the low-rise design of the extension provides sufficient contrast with the two-storey form of the host dwelling to be seen as an evident extension to the dwelling. Care has been taken to ensure that the design of the extension is sympathetic to the existing fenestration and appearance of the main dwelling.
- 1.1.10 Thus, while the proposed rear extension would not directly comply with the size criteria of Policy HS6 insofar as being 'subordinate', I argue that the proposal accords with the overarching requirement for extensions to be sympathetic to their surroundings and of an appropriate design and scale for their siting. Views of the rear extension from the street would be minimal, meaning that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the established street character.
- 1.1.11 Overall, I consider the proposal to be of an appropriate design in accordance with Policies D1, D2 and HS6 of the NHLP, as well as Section 12 of the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbours

- 1.1.12 Policy D3 of the Local Plan permits development which would not harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and encourages the use of mitigation measures where necessary. Policy D3 is generally reflected by the provisions of the NPPF.
- 1.1.13 The extension would be positioned along the north boundary, which immediately borders the long access track to a dwelling to the north-east, Grassways. Beyond this access track is the rear curtilage of neighbouring property, The Cottage.
- 1.1.14 While the proposed extension would be sited in close proximity to the north boundary, the buffer of the access track would mitigate immediate impacts to the north. Furthermore, the combined single storey nature of the extension, and the mature vegetation along the north boundary, would reduce the visual bulk of extension when

viewed from the north. Due to the large plot size of the dwelling, impacts of the extension upon neighbouring properties to the south, Aspen and Tree Tops, would be negligible. Regarding outlook, the majority of the proposed glazing would face in to the White House's rear garden. All proposed north facing windows would be obscure glazed. I therefore consider that the proposed rear extension would not have unacceptable overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impacts upon neighbouring properties.

1.1.15 On account of the large plot size and the adequate distance maintained between neighbouring properties, I find the repositioning of the outbuilding to the south of the garden to be unobjectionable in relation to neighbour amenity impacts.

1.1.16 Overall, the proposal accords with Policy D3 of the NHLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Highways and Parking

1.1.17 The site provides adequate on-parking provision and therefore complies with Policy T2 of the NHLP.

Environmental Implications

1.1.18 Policy D1 of the NHLP outlines the Council's commitment to supporting climate change mitigation through the requirement for schemes to incorporate the principles of 'sustainable design'; with which the proposal is commensurate with. Policy D1 is broadly consistent with the aims of Section 14 of the NPPF. There are no other environmental implications as a result of the proposed development.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

4.3.19 This is a form of development which is exempt from BNG Legislation, defined under article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 due it falling under the scope of the 'de minimis' exemption.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission is **GRANTED**.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

4.5.1 None.

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 None.

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 rear extension hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwellinghouse known as The White House.

Reason: To avoid an inadequate standard of amenity for both the host dwelling and neighbouring properties and to comply with Policies HS6 and D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 to 2031.

Proactive Statement:

0. 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 (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning

(Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed  Shaun Greaves Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 21 July 2026	