

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...William Thompson.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
25/01335/FPH	Single storey front extension	14 Common Rise Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 0HL

Submitted Plan Nos

I2D-2025-02-1 I2D-2025-02-2

1.0 Policies

D1 Sustainable design

D2 House exts, replcmnt dwellings outbuild

D3 Protecting living conditions

T2 Parking

SECN12 Achieving well-designed places

SECN14 Meeting climate change,coastal,flooding

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 16/01863/1HH - Two storey side extension

Conditional Permission

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Neighbour consultations** – None received.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The site is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling on the east side of Common Rise, Hitchin. The site benefits from a driveway and front and rear garden.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 Single storey front extension.

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 impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- The impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
- Access and parking matters.
- The impact of the proposed development on the environment.

Design

- 4.3.2 Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires that development proposals respond positively to the site's local context, retain existing vegetation and minimise the visual impact of street furniture and parking provision. Policy D2 of the Local Plan requires extensions to houses to incorporate design that is sympathetic to the main dwelling in terms of its scale, form and orientation and does not harm the character and appearance of the locality around the site. These policies are broadly consistent with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.3.3 The proposed single storey front porch extension would have a width of 5.6m, a depth of 4.0m and have a dual-pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.4m and a peak of 4.1m. The new front entrance door would be on the south side elevation and would have a canopy extending 1.0m from the proposed side elevation wall. The proposal includes 3no. rooflights. The proposed external materials are all set to match existing.
- 4.3.4 While the streetscene is varied, in terms of front porches and unaltered dwellings, it is considered that by reason of the scale of the proposed front extension that the

development would run contrary to the grain of development and appear as an incongruous addition to the dwelling and streetscene which would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. The vegetation along the front boundary line may provide an element of screening; however, the proposal would remain fully visible from the streetscene and be roughly 1.2m taller than the vegetation.

- 4.3.5 In my view, while the proposed materials palette is sympathetic to the existing dwelling, the massing of the proposal to the front elevation would result in a disproportionate extension, which is unsympathetic in scale, and would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and streetscene. The NPPF at paragraph 139 (b) sets out that proposed development that offers 'outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings' should be given significant weight. The proposal does not fit in with the form and layout of the surroundings, does not complement or enhance the character of the street scene and therefore fails to meet the requirements of paragraph 139 (b). As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan and would not be in accordance with paragraph 139 (b) of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact on Neighbours

- 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 NHLP.
- 4.3.9 Regarding no.161 Common Rise, the adjoining neighbour, the additional bulk of the proposal may cause some additional shading to front elevation, ground floor window at no.161; however, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm upon the no.161's living conditions as to be objectionable in terms of over dominance, shading or overlooking.
- 4.3.11 This development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy D3 of the NHLP and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Highways and Parking:

- 4.3.12 The proposal does not include an increase in the number of bedrooms. Therefore, with regard to Policy T2 of the NHLP, there would be no car parking issues arising from the development.

Environmental Implications

- 4.3.13 The proposed development would be consistent with the criteria set out in Policy D1 of the NHLP '*Sustainable Design*'. There are no other significant environmental implications as a result of the proposed development.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

- 4.3.14 This is a form of development which is exempt from BNG Legislation, defined under article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 due it falling under the scope of the 'de minimis' exemption.

4.4 **Conclusion**

- 4.4.1 In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission is **REFUSED**.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

- 4.5.1 None.

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

- 4.6.1 None.

5.0 **Recommendation**

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

1. By virtue of the massing to the front elevation , the proposal is considered to be disproportionate in terms of scale and cause harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene. The proposal therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policies D1 and D2 of the North Herts Local Plan and paragraph 139 of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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: 9 July 2025	