DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Heather Lai.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01364/FPH	Single storey rear and side extensions. Front entrance porch.	29 Sycamore Close Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 7SN

Submitted Plan Nos

IPP-10-01 IPP-10-01 IPP-10-02 IPP-10-03 IPP-10-04 IPP-10-05 IPP-10-06 IPP-10-07 Rev. A IPP-10-08 IPP-10-09 IPP-11-03 IPP-11-03 IPP-11-04 IPP-11-05 IPP-12-01 IPP-12-02 IPP-12-03 IPP-12-04

1.0 Policies

1.0 **Planning Policy**

1.1. **North Hertfordshire District Council Local Plan No. 2 with alterations**

Policy 28 – Housing Extensions
Policy 33- Relatives and Staff Accommodation
Policy 55 – Car Parking Standards

1.2. **National Planning Policy Framework**

Section 7 – Requiring good design

1.3. **Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031 (Approved by Full Council 11th April 2017)**

D1 - Sustainable Design;
D2 – House extensions and replacement dwellings;
D3 – Protecting living conditions;
HS6 - Relatives and dependents' Accommodation
T2 – Parking

1.4. **Supplementary Planning Document**

Vehicle Parking at New Development September 2011

2.0 **Site History**

No planning history on record.

3.0 **Representations**

Neighbour representations:

1 objection:
Extension will be visible above side boundary wall and will be overbearing and create a sense of enclosure.
Non-structural extension to the rear of the east side ground floor extension would be visible from adjacent properties and would cause a visual amenity problem

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

The application site is an unlisted two storey detached dwelling located outside a conservation area. The surrounding area is residential in character, and forms part of a modern residential development.

4.2 **Proposal**

The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a single storey wraparound side-rear extension, single storey side extension to the east elevation, and an extension to the front porch area.

4.3 **Key Issues**

Design:

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 application seeks the erection of a single storey wraparound side extension that would taper off at an angle across the rear elevation. The extension is to be formed of brickwork to match the existing dwelling, and aluminium framed windows and doors. There are to be two bi-folding doors to the rear elevation. It will be visible only from limited private views; only the top of the extension will be visible above the existing high boundary walls, however given that the most prominent view would be from the side of adjacent no. 31 Sycamore Close it is considered this would not result in a visual amenity impact. It is considered the design, scale and materiality of the wraparound extension are acceptable and relate well to the host building.

To the east it is proposed to erect a single storey side extension, which would be formed of brick and glazing. The side extension would have two aluminium glazed panels to either end of the extension, and a brick flank wall which would project beyond the rear of the extension by approximately 1.5m. A black flue is to be installed above the side extension, which would terminate internally. While the neighbour objection is noted, it is considered given the scale, position and relationship of the side extension to adjacent no. 27 the proposal would not result in an unacceptable visual amenity impact. The proposed extension is to be formed of similar materials to the host building, is to be subservient and will be visible only from limited private views which will be partially obscured by the existing side boundary fence. In addition the side extension to the east of the property is to sit adjacent to the rear of no. 27 and will be forward of the building line of this dwelling. As such it is considered it will not result in a materially worse situation for the occupants of no. 27 and surrounding dwellings.

The proposed flue is to be of a small scale, will have limited visibility to the side of this dwelling and will not appear a discordant feature on this modern dwelling.

The erection of a glazed porch area to the front entrance will give more floorspace to the dwelling, is of a small scale and will sit adjacent an existing box shaped bay window. It is considered the glazed porch area will match the host building in terms of materiality and design and no objection is raised to this element in design terms.

The proposed erection of a single storey wraparound side-rear extension, single storey side extension to the east and an extension to the front porch area are considered acceptable in terms of their design, materiality, scale and positioning and accord with Policy 28 of the saved Local Plan, and Policies D2 and D3 of the emerging Local Plan.

Amenity:

Policy 28 states that side extensions adjoining a residential plot to the side will normally be refused if at first-floor level or above they are less than 1 metre from the boundary.

To the west it is proposed to erect a wraparound side extension that would extend 3m beyond the rear building line. It would be 2.9m high, and would be visible above the existing high boundary wall with no. 31 Sycamore Close. However the existing window to the flank wall of no. 31 is below the height of the boundary wall and therefore will not result in a sense of overlooking. While it may result in an increased sense of enclosure, it is considered this window has already been compromised owing to the existing relationship to the host building, and the boundary wall. The window to no. 31 is located to the west of the application site and therefore the erection of a 2.9m high single storey extension, which would be 1m from the boundary at the narrowest point will not result in a material loss of light.

To the rear, the closest residential property is no. 23 Sycamore Close, which has its principal elevation facing away from the application site. The site plan shows the rear extension would be approximately 9m from the rear boundary of the property and therefore would not result in a loss of light or increased sense of enclosure. While the rear extension is to be fitted with extensive glazing, including 2 no. bifolding doors, it is considered given the distance, and

positioning of adjacent properties to the south, the proposed rear extension would not result in a loss of privacy to properties to the rear.

No. 27 Sycamore Close is adjacent to the application site to the south east, and has its principal elevation facing away from the application site. It is proposed to erect a 2.9m high single storey side extension to the east side elevation. This would be 5.8m long, with glazing to both ends. The side of the extension would be brick, and would be 7.2m long, extending to the rear to prevent overlooking to or from the extension and the rear of no. 27.

An objection has been received stating that this extension would result in a visual amenity impact to the occupants of no. 27, and in particular the brick flank wall. As stated above it is considered this extension is acceptable in visual amenity terms, and as there is an existing high boundary wall between no. 27 and the application site, and the dwelling at no. 27 is located to the south east of the host building it is considered the extension will not result in a material loss of light. Given the existing relationship of the dwellings it is considered the proposed single storey side extension which will be 1.9m in width, and 7.2m at its longest point will not result in a material increase in enclosure, and only 1m of the extension would be visible above the existing boundary fence.
The glazed element to the rear of the extension would face the rear of the application site, however the brick flank wall is to be extended beyond the proposed building line by 1.7m and therefore will not result in an increase in overlooking.

The proposal is considered acceptable in amenity terms and will not result in a material loss of amenity for neighbouring occupiers.

Parking:

The proposed development would not trigger the requirement for additional car parking to be provided within the application site.

4.4 **Conclusion**
In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission should be **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.

Proactive Statement:

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 (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: 21 June 2018	