

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Andrew Hunter.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
25/00288/FPH	Two storey rear extension; front porch and insertion of first floor rear window and rooflight to existing side roofslope.	9 The Green Lower Road Tea Green Luton Hertfordshire LU2 8PS

Submitted Plan Nos

1220-01 1220-02 1220-03 1220-04

1.0 Policies

D1 Sustainable design

D2	House exts, replcmnt dwellings outbuild
D3	Protecting living conditions
SECN12	Achieving well-designed places
SECN13	Protecting Green Belt Land
SECN9	Promoting sustainable transport
SP5	Countryside and Green Belt
SP6	Sustainable transport
T2	Parking
SP9	Design and Sustainability

2.0 **Relevant site history**

- 2.1 21/02656/FPH - Erection of front elevation porch, insertion of rooflight to existing side elevation roofslope, insertion of first floor rear elevation window, two storey rear extension and front garden layout changed to provide extra parking spaces – Approved 25/10/21.

3.0 **Representations**

- 3.1 None received.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The site is a two storey end-of-terrace dwelling with a pitched roof. The site is in an area of rural character, with a small number of dwellings and a pub nearby. The site is within the Green Belt.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 The application is for a two storey rear extension with a pitched roof, a rear dormer window, and a single storey front extension. A new side rooflight and new side window are also shown. The number of bedrooms will not be increased.

4.3 **Key Issues**

- 4.3.1 The key material considerations are whether the development is acceptable in principle, design, neighbour amenity, and parking.

Principle

- 4.3.2 The site is in the Green Belt in the adopted Local Plan. Whether developments in the Green Belt are acceptable in principle will depend on whether they comply with the NPPF and Policy SP5 of the Local Plan, and if there are any other material considerations relevant.

- 4.3.3 The NPPF in paragraphs 154 and 155 sets out what development is not inappropriate in the Green Belt, with the relevant parts of those paragraphs stating:

154. A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;

- 4.3.4 In assessing the proposal against the above criteria, the proposed development is considered to be extensions to the dwelling. "Original building" in this context is the dwelling as it existed in 1948. The site has no planning history prior to 21/02656/FPH. In the assessment of that application, the dwelling was considered to be original. The dwelling has not been extended since 21/02656/FPH was determined, therefore it's considered to remain original.

- 4.3.5 The enlargements proposed to the dwelling are the same as those approved under 21/02656/FPH, which were assessed as being approx. 40% of the floorspace and 50% of the volume of the original building. Extensions of this size and scale were not considered disproportionate additions when the 2021 application was approved, and this remains the case. The proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and is considered acceptable in principle. The proposal complies with Policy SP5 of the Local Plan, and Section 13 of the NPPF.

Design

- 4.3.6 There are no objections to the openings, rear dormer and front porch. The rear extension would not be small, however I consider it would be of an acceptable size in relation to the host dwelling.

- 4.3.7 The rear elevation of the rear extension would have a large first floor window, however I do not consider it harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling as it would correlate to the shape of the rear of the extension, would be distinct from the main original dwelling, and would be at the rear where it would have very limited visibility from areas of public view.
- 4.3.8 The extensions are of the same size and design as those approved by the recent 2021 permission which is given weight. Overall I consider the proposals of an acceptable design. The proposal complies with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan, and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Neighbour amenity

- 4.3.9 The rear dormer and front extension would be small and will not harm neighbour amenity. The rear extension would have a depth of approx. 3.3m from the furthest back rear wall of the host dwelling and approx. 7.2m from the roof ridge, would not be small, and would be visible from both next door dwellings Nos. 8 and 10.
- 4.3.10 No. 8 is to the north, which presently has a rear depth similar to that of No. 9. The proposed extension would project beyond this, however due to the distance of the extension from the boundary and the rear of No. 9 I do not consider that the extension would appear overbearing or cause harmful loss of light. I do not consider that the side openings shown would cause loss of privacy as two would be at ground floor level, and the other would be a high level rooflight. Impacts on No. 8 are considered acceptable.
- 4.3.11 Turning to No. 10, the rear extension would be to its north and would not cause loss of light. The extension would however be visible from its rear openings and rear garden, albeit it would be set off the boundary which would limit its impacts.
- 4.3.12 The extension would be of the same size, design and siting as that approved under previous planning permission 21/02656/FPH, including openings that would face towards No. 10. The rear elevation and boundary of No. 10 remains the same or similar to now. As was the case with 21/02656/FPH, the present application is not considered harmful to the amenity of No. 10. Impacts on amenity are acceptable, and the proposal complies with Policy D3 of the Local Plan.

Parking

- 4.3.13 The site would have parking provision for at least two cars, which is acceptable. The proposal complies with Policy T2 of the Local Plan.

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**.

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 extension(s) hereby permitted shall be built in external materials to match the existing dwellinghouse unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

Reason: To protect the visual amenities of the locality and to comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the North Hertfordshire Local Plan 2011 to 2031.

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 (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed  Sam Dicocco Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 10 April 2025	

