DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Richard Tiffin.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00190/FPH	Partial two and single storey rear extensions, single storey front porch and side extensions, demolition of existing outbuilding and removal of chimney stack.	32 Lammas Way Letchworth Garden City Hertfordshire SG6 4LW

Submitted Plan Nos

ILW-03; ILW-01; ILW-02; ILW-04; Rev 03 Location Plan

1.0 Policies

SECT7 Requiring Good Design

LP28	House Extensions
XD2	Hse Extns,Replacement Dwells,Outbuilding

2.0 Site History

2.1 Similar two storey full width rear extension dismissed at appeal (17/00812/1HH).

3.0 Representations

3.1 **Neighbours** – Neighbours at 28, 30 and 34 Lammas Way have written in raising concerns about impact in the street scene, dominance, living conditions and overlooking.

4.0 Planning Considerations

4.1 Site and Surroundings

4.1.1 The application property is a post war former local authority terrace on the Grange Estate.

4.2 Proposal

4.2.1 The application proposes a partial two storey rear extension set in from the boundary with the attached property at 34 some 1.6m. A flat roof single storey is specified in this gap. Both extensions would be 4.2m deep – the two storey element specified with a hipped roof to reduce impact and the single storey with a parapet style flat roof. The scheme also proposes a single storey pitched roof wrap around front and side extension some 1m deep to the side and 1.3m deep to the front. Following discussion with the applicant the scheme has been amended to specify a render first floor to break up the elevation and reflect more natural light, particularly to the attached neighbour at No 34.

4.3 Key Issues

4.3.1 The key issues in this case centre on the impact of the scheme on the street scene and the reasonable living conditions of the attached neighbour at No 34. Being set in from the shared boundary with No 34, the proposed extension at 4.2m deep would not occasion any adverse impact in terms of daylight or sunlight in my view. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the neighbour has a single storey rear extension at a similar depth and that this second scheme specifies a hipped roof which would reduce impact further. The amount of light would be enhanced by the specification of render at first floor.

4.3.2 In terms of impact on the neighbours at 90 degrees to the application property, namely No's 30 and 28, the Inspector was not concerned about loss of amenity based on the specification of blank elevation facing these properties. However, the Inspector did express concerns about the impact of a 4m + blank elevation in the street scene. The applicant, in seeking to address this concern had specified a window at first floor in the 4m extension facing No 30. While this may have addressed the problem of a 'blank' wall it unfortunately introduced a problem in terms of the reasonable living conditions of No 30 in my view. Following discussion with the applicant it was agreed to remove the window and render at first floor to break up the elevation.

4.3.3 The single storey side and front extension would improve the appearance of the existing dwelling in my view. With regard to the impact on the dwellings to the side and rear of No 32 (30 and 28 Lammas Way) the original case officer commented as follows:

28 Lammas Way
This property is situated to the north-west of the application site and part of the rear garden bounds the rear of the application site. However, given the distance between the proposed extension and no.28 I do not consider that the living conditions of no.28 would be significant affected by the two storey extension. I accept that the two casement windows that are proposed for the rear of the extension may offer glimpse views into the rear section of the garden but I do not consider that this would result in a significant loss of privacy. Overall it is my view that the living conditions of no.28 would not be affected by the proposal.

I agree with this conclusion.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The applicant has responded to the refusal of planning permission and the dismissed appeal by re-designing the extension to reduce its impact on the neighbour at No 34. Further he has altered the design to remove a first floor window and render to introduce interest. These modifications have satisfactorily addressed the expressed concerns and I now consider the scheme acceptable subject to standard conditions.

5.0 **<u>Recommendation</u>**

5.1 That planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be completed before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this decision notice.

   Reason: As required by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q.2.-(3)

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 render at first floor shall be painted using a cream or white coloured mainsonary paint and permamentily maintained as such.

Reason: To enhance relflected solar radiation and introduce interest to the flank elevation.

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  Simon Ellis Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 19 March 2018	