**DELEGATED FILE NOTE**

**CASE OFFICER:** ...Jo Cousins.....

| APPLICATION REFERENCE | BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT | APPLICATION SITE |
|---|---|---|
| 18/00408/FPH | Part two storey, part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory and single storey front porch extension (as amended by plans received 31 May 2018). | 21 Highfield<br>Letchworth Garden City<br>Hertfordshire<br>SG6 3QD |

**Submitted Plan Nos**

Location Plan; Block Plan E1; E2; E3; E4; P1A; P2A; P3A; P4A; P5A

**1.0 Policies**

LP28 House Extensions

| | |
|---|---|
| LP57 | Residential Guidelines and Standards |
| LP58 | Letchworth Garden City Design Principles |
| SECT7 | Requiring Good Design |
| XD1 | Sustainable Design |
| XD2 | Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding |
| XD3 | Protecting Living Conditions |

## 2.0 Site History

2.1 None.

## 3.0 Representations

3.1 The occupiers of **23 Highfield** have written raising objections summarised as follows:-
1) Loss of light
2) Overbearing impact
3) Front extension out of keeping
4) Potential light nuisance through proposed rooflight
5) Other similar cases refused in last 12 months

See letter in Anite/website for full details.

## 4.0 Planning Considerations

### 4.1 Site & Surroundings

4.1.1 21 Highfield is a semi-detached residential property located on the southern-western side of the road, almost opposite the junction with Sollershott West. The property benefits from a rear garden over 35m long which adjoins the Highfield School grounds.

### 4.2 Proposal

4.2.1 The scheme has been amended to reduce the depth of the two storey element and hip the roof to the two storey element. The proposals as amended are as follows:-

Single storey rear extension – this would replace a single storey addition 3.1m deep by 3.3m wide. This element would be 5m deep by 6.3m wide and would form part of the ground floor alterations to provide a large living space. The addition would have a flat roof containing a lantern light.

First floor rear extension (as amended) – This would be over the single storey element and would be 4.3m wide by 4m deep to form a master bedroom with en-suite. The roof would be hipped and set approx. 1.4m lower than the main ridge of the property. This element would be set in by approx. 2.2 metres from the boundary with 23 Highfield. At first floor a window is shown in the side elevation facing No.19 which was to serve an en-suite. In discussions with the agent this has been shown in error but he is away and can not update the drawings and therefore agrees to an obscure glazing condition. A Juliet balcony feature would be included on the rear elevation.

Single storey front extension (as amended) - 2.5 metre wide by 2m deep, this addition would have a simple lean-to roof linked to the roof of the parent building containing one roof light. The addition would provide a ground floor cloakroom.

Facing materials are proposed to match those used in the construction of the host dwelling at the front and due to the proximity of the ground floor to the neighbours garden wall the agent has now noted the ground floor walls to be brick to match the house (as this can be built overhand) not render. The first floor remains render as previously proposed. Roofing would be tiles to match the existing structure. The site benefits from off-street parking for at least two cars.

**4.3 Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:
--The impact that the proposed development would have on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
--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 car parking in the area.

4.3.2 Impact on neighbouring properties
Given the layout of the application site, the key issue for consideration is the impact that the proposed development would have on the living conditions of the adjoining property, no. 19 Highfield to the south-east and no. 23 Highfield to the north-east.

23 Highfield - The flank wall of the two storey element is proposed to be positioned approximately 2.2m from the boundary with this property and the depth of the addition has been reduced and a hipped roof employed. That property is to the north west and one of the main issue the neighbour has expressed would be loss of daylight/sunlight and a general loss of light. The distance, form of development and materials is acceptable and would ensure that the two storey element would not result in any material or sustainable harm in terms of a loss of light to windows or over-dominance. The single storey element will be built up to the boundary line with the neighbouring property and would extend beyond their garden wall. However when considered against the fall back position for permitted development (and neighbour consultation scheme) potentially a 6m long addition could be built here. The single storey element would be 3m high. It is noted that No.23 does have a rear addition and that there is a living room window closest to the boundary. However I do not consider that any perceived loss of light or sunlight would be so detrimental to justify withholding the grant of planning permission in this instance..
A new lantern roof light window is shown to be adjacent to the boundary and that the neighbour is concerned that this would cause light spillage. I do not consider that this window

would be so detrimental to justify a reason for refusal here a lantern light could be placed in this position as permitted development should a single storey only development be proposed (subject to the relevant depth criteria).

19 Highfield - The proposed first floor rear extension would be situated 4m from the boundary, and due to the orientation of the site and relationship I do not consider that a material loss of amenity would arise as a result of the development. A side window at first floor in the proposed flank wall has been shown. This would serve a bedroom/en-suite and should be conditioned to be obscure glazed. . Overall I do not consider that a sustainable reason for refusal on loss of privacy would be justifiable or reasonable.

The single storey front extension would be adjacent to a driveway and would be set away from either boundary. Given the distances involved, I do not therefore consider that the proposed extension would result in any harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring properties.

4.3.3 Policy 28 - Design and appearance
Policy 28 suggests that house extensions are generally acceptable providing they are *"...sympathetic to the existing house in height, form, proportions, window details and materials..."* and *"...pitched roofs are used where appropriate..."*
The proposed extensions as amended are designed so as to reduce the visual bulk and appearance of the proposals. The roof forms join to the parent building and being set to the rear and single storey only at the front would not be visually dominant in the street scene. The design is such that the development would be subservient to the host building and would not be incongruous in the street scene.
Overall it is my view that the proposed development would be compliant with the relevant local and national planning policy regarding house extensions and design.

4.3.5 Impact on visual amenity
The rear extension would not be visually intrusive in the street scene due to the configuration of properties in the area and distance from the highway. With regard to the front addition the site has a high hedge to the front which would screen the property. However, even if this did not exist the development would not be out of character or visually dominant in my view.

4.3.6 Car parking
The application site can accommodate at least two off-street parking spaces. The proposed development would not trigger the requirement for additional car parking to be provided within the application site and this is a highly sustainable location within walking distance of t Letchworth retail facilities and public transport routes.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 In the absence of material or sustainable grounds for objection I have framed a favourable recommendation accordingly.

## 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 window at first floor level on the side elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass.

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

**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.

| | |
|---|---|
| Signed<br><br>Simon Ellis<br><br>Determining Officer | Development Management<br>North Hertfordshire District Council<br>Council Offices<br>Gernon Road<br>Letchworth<br>Herts<br>SG6 3JF |
| **Date:** 24 July 2018 | |