

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Vicki Wood.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
25/00381/FPH	Single storey side extension, installation of rooflights to existing front and box dormer to existing rear roofslope to facilitate conversion of loftspace into habitable accommodation, relocation of existing front door and erection of front entrance canopy following demolition of existing chimney, existing side conservatory and detached garage.	Tall Timbers 1b Melbourn Road Royston Hertfordshire SG8 7DB

Submitted Plan Nos

8396-P03 8396-P06 8397-P01 8397-P02A 8397-P04 8397-P05

1.0 Policies

1.0 **Local and National Policy**

1.1 **National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF)**

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Section 14 - Meeting the challenges of climate change, flooding and coastal change

1.2 **North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 (NHLP)**

Strategic Policies

Policy SP1 – Sustainable Development in North Hertfordshire

Policy SP2 – Settlement Hierarchy and Spatial Distribution

Policy SP9 – Design and Sustainability

Development Management Policies

Policy D1 – Sustainable design

Policy D2 – House extensions, replacement dwellings and outbuildings

Policy D3 – Protecting living conditions

2.0 **Relevant Site History**

2.1 84/01712/1 - Erection of detached bungalow and garage. Conditional Permission.

2.2 91/01502/1 – Front conservatory. Conditional Permission.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Site and Neighbour Consultation** – Three objections and one letter of support have been received. The letter of support is from 13 Queens Road, Royston and the objections are from: 13 Cherry Drive, Royston, 17 Eastfield, Royston and Attwaters Jameson Hill Solicitors of 72-74 Fore Street Herts on behalf of the Owner/Occupiers of Westwood, 1A Melbourn Road, Royston.

- Visibility of the box dormer from the public domain.
- Not in keeping with other residential properties along this part of Melbourn Road.
- Does not respond positively to its context.
- Does not follow the principles of good design.
- Proposal is not in keeping with the existing building.
- Over development by virtue of mass and height on no.1A.

- Impact on neighbouring property no.1A (dwelling and garden) due to dominance of box dormer.
- Side extension creates unacceptable bulk and massing which is not sympathetic to no.1A.
- Shadowing to no.1A and impact on daylight.
- Lack of detail in relation to sustainable drainage, improvements on energy and waste or appropriate new planting.
- Contrary to Local Plan Policy.

Royston Town Council – None received.

NHC Environmental Health (Noise & Other Nuisance) – Insufficient details submitted to determine impact of the proposed ASHP unit.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The application site lies on the east side of Melbourn Road and comprises of a detached bungalow which sits at a right angle within the plot. The attached conservatory lies to the west side elevation and there is a detached garage sited to the southeast corner of the plot and rear of the bungalow. The front boundary with Melbourn Road benefits from mature planting with the remainder of the site being cleared and currently rubble with some hardstanding. Neighbouring dwellings exist to the north and south of the property.
- 4.1.2 The application site is within the settlement boundary for Royston where development is generally acceptable subject to policy requirements.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 Single storey side extension, installation of rooflights to existing front and box dormer to existing rear roof slope to facilitate conversion of loft space into habitable accommodation, relocation of existing front door and erection of front entrance canopy following demolition of existing chimney, existing side conservatory and detached garage.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- 4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:
 - The acceptability of the design of the proposed development and its resultant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The impact that the proposed development would have on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
 - The impact that the proposed development would have on car parking provision in the area.
 - The impact that the proposed development would have on the environment.

Design and Appearance

- 4.3.2 The objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) include those seeking to secure the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places (Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places). Paragraph 131 of the NPPF states that *“Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities”*. In this regard, Policy D1 and D2 of the Local Plan are consistent with the objectives set out within the NPPF.
- 4.3.3 Following demolition of an existing conservatory to the west side of the dwelling, the development would see the erection of a single storey extension which would match the width and height of the existing dwelling. The extension would extend 5.2 metres to the west plus the addition of a covered entrance would extend this a further 1.0 metres taking the total extension to 6.2 metres. The extension would extend beyond the footprint of the two-storey neighbouring property to the north and would be 1.8 metres from the party boundary. Openings would be an obscure glazed window to the north elevation with further openings and relocated entrance door with new canopy to the west side elevation and two velux rooflights to the south side roof slope. Materials would comprise of a brick plinth with render above with roof tiles matching those of the existing dwelling and window frames being a grey colour. Whilst the principle of an extension is acceptable on the west side elevation, the design is considered unacceptable and unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and its context. In addition, the unacceptable design, scale, mass and bulk of the proposed extension is considered excessive resulting in a development contrary to Policy D1 and D2 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.
- 4.3.4 A flat roofed box dormer is proposed to the north side roof slope together with an ASHP at ground floor level. The box dormer would have a length of 8.6 metres and a width of 3.7 metres. The height of the dormer would match the ridge height of the existing dwelling with eaves height set up from that of the existing dwelling. Openings would take the form of two windows with one to each cheek and a rooflight. Materials would be hanging tile with felt covering to the roof. The design is considered unacceptable and unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and its context. In addition, the unacceptable design, scale, mass and bulk of the dormer together with unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the street scene is considered excessive resulting in a development contrary to Policy D1 and D2 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF. When considering the proposed box dormer under Class B, Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the GDPO 2015 (as amended), this would fail in that the materials used in the exterior work are not of a similar appearance to those used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse and the submitted plans appear to indicate that the proposed rooflight would exceed the height of the ridge of the existing roof. Subject to those points, the box dormer could otherwise be considered as permitted development, in my view.
- 4.3.5 To the south side roof slope, six velux rooflights are proposed, four of which would be to the existing dwelling with two in the proposed side extension. I raise no objection to the insertion of four velux roof lights to the existing dwelling which would comply with Policy D1 and D2 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF. Neither do I raise an objection to the demolition of the existing garage as there remains adequate off-street parking within the plot.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

- 4.3.6 A core planning principle set out in the NPPF is to always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. This principle is reflected in the provisions of Policy D3 of the Local Plan.
- 4.3.7 The distance to the party boundary of the neighbouring property no.1A Melbourn Road to the north is 1.8 metres and whilst I accept that the proposed extension is single storey, its position, forward of the footprint of no.1A and the position of a large window to their main living area on the south side elevation would, in my view, result in a loss of daylight and sunlight to that room which would result in a harmful impact on the day to day living conditions of the occupants. In addition, the box dormer would introduce a significant amount of bulk to the north side roof slope which would result in the outlook from the upper floor bedroom windows of no.1A being onto a solid blank wall. I therefore find that the design, scale, mass and bulk of the proposed extension and box dormer would result in harm to the reasonable living conditions and well-being of neighbours and as such is likely to have a significant impact on existing residential amenity and is therefore contrary to Policy D3 of the Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.
- 4.3.8 Whilst I raise no objection in principle to the proposed installation of an ASHP at ground floor level to the north side elevation, no details have been provided as to design, type and output. Therefore, in the absence of such details I am unable to support such an installation at this time due to the potential impact on existing residential amenity.

Highways and Parking

- 4.3.9 The proposed development does not include an increase in the number of bedrooms, therefore there would be no car parking issues arising from the proposed development.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

- 4.3.10 The application is a householder which is exempt from BNG legislation defined under article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Environmental Implications

- 4.3.11 Section 14 of the NPPF sets out how the planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future. The principles set out in Section 14 are reflected in Policy D1 of the Local Plan, which sets out that development proposals should take all reasonable opportunities to reduce energy consumption and waste, retain existing vegetation and propose new appropriate planting, and future proof for changes in technology and lifestyle.
- 4.3.12 In my view, the proposed development would be unlikely to have any significant implications for the local environment in terms of carbon emissions and therefore would be generally in accordance with Policy D1 of the Local Plan and Section 14 of the NPPF.

4.4 Conclusion

- 4.4.1 The proposed development is contrary to Policies SP1, SP9, D1, D2 and D3 of the Local Plan 2011-2031 and Sections 2 and 12 of the NPPF 2024.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

4.5.1 N/A

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 N/A

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proposed side extension, by reason of its siting, design, scale, form and bulk extending forward of its footprint would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the locality. The proposed development would fail to comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 and Section 12 of the NPPF (2024).
2. The proposed box dormer, by reason of its siting, design, scale, form and bulk would introduce an unacceptable overbearing impact upon the occupiers of the adjoining neighbouring property (1A Melbourn Road). The proposed development would fail to comply with Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 and Section 12 of the NPPF (2024).
3. Insufficient details of the proposed Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) have been submitted, by reason of its design, capacity and output to ensure a satisfactory impact upon the existing residential amenity of the occupiers of the adjoining neighbouring property (1A Melbourn Road). The proposed development would fail to comply with Policy D3 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011-2031 and Section 12 of the NPPF (2024).

Proactive Statement:

Planning permission has been refused for this proposal for the clear reasons set out in this decision notice. The Council has not acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant as in the Council's view the proposal is unacceptable in principle and the fundamental objections cannot be overcome through dialogue. Since no solutions can be found the Council has complied with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed  Anne McDonald	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Determining Officer Date: 25 April 2025	