DELEGATED FILE NOTE

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

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00579/FP	Erection of two storey three bedroom house adjoining 88 Maddles with associated works. Single storey rear extension to 88 Maddles following demolition of existing conservatory.	88 Maddles Letchworth Garden City Hertfordshire SG6 2RL

Submitted Plan Nos

PL.001; PL.002; PL.003; PL.004; PL.005; PL.006; PL.007; PL.008;

1.0 Policies

LP57 Residential Guidelines and Standards

SECT7 Requiring Good Design

XD3 Protecting Living Conditions

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 None.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Neighbours** – representations received from neighbours raising concerns about the impact on parking, the street scene and overlooking

3.2 **Highways** – No objection subject to conditions

3.3 **Env Protection** – No objection

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The application site comprises the side and rear garden of No 88 – a post war end of terrace property on this planned estate of similar properties.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 The application proposes a new dwelling staggered back on the end of this terrace. The new dwelling would be two storey and protrude rearward of the existing terrace by some 6.8m . Parking for the new 3 bed dwelling would be provided in tandem via a double dropped kerb. The donor property would be provided with a single parking space. A generous rear garden would is specified for both properties. The scheme also includes a small single storey extension to the donor property which would otherwise by permitted development.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues in this case centre on the impact of the scheme on the reasonable living conditions of the neighbours, the appearance in the street scene and parking arrangements. The specified rear amenity space would remains relatively generous in my view and would not be an issue in my view.

4.3.2 The most obvious planning concern with this scheme is the relationship the new dwelling would have with the donor property and the other dwellings in the terrace. Being set back nearly 7m it would present a full two storey elevation to no 88 completely dominating the rear aspect of this property. The degree of domination would be oppressive in my view making this property gloomy and the occupiers would

certainly perceive the new property as overbearing. That the donor is the applicants house makes no difference to the effect and to support such a scheme would be poor planning in my view and reason for refusal alone. Moreover, such is the depth of the proposed new flank that its impact would extend beyond just the donor. The other dwellings in the terrace would also be affected most notably No 90. The scale of the intrusion would certainly be overbearing in the aspect currently enjoyed from this property.

4.3.3 In terms of the general street scene, the impact of the dwelling from the front would be less marked albeit it would be at odds with formally planned terrace of 5 dwellings. Of more concern is the accommodation of two tandem car parking spaces which would dominate the front garden leaving no room for landscaping. This coupled with the single car parking space for the donor property, itself a three bedroom property, would occasion a further degradation of the street scene and the planned layout of the area. Further, the width of the proposed dwelling would necessitate the building being right on the boundary to the south reducing any sense of spaciousness between the new property and No 83. This in my view is poor design.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The addition of dwelling here could not be said to improve the character of the area and the way it functions as required by paragraph 64 of the NPPF. While I accept the applicant's argument that the need for homes is a pressing social and economic consideration and that arguably the weighted presumption in paragraph 14 of the Framework should apply, I am firmly of the view the harm to the character of the area and the reasonable living conditions of neighbouring properties, is such that it significantly and demonstrably outweighs the modest benefit which might result from an additional dwelling.

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission be **REFUSED** for the following reasons**:**

1. By reason of its occupation of the full width of the plot, staggered design on a terrace and the introduction tandem and contrived parking spaces to the front, the proposal would occasion an undesirable subdivision of the existing curtilage of number 88 Maddles such that would result in an unacceptably cramped form of development as viewed from the street. This would harm the character, appearance and openness of this planned estate and give rise to development which is inappropriate in its context and fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. This would amount to poor design and be contrary to the requirements of Sections 6 and 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. If implemented and repeated, such development would further erode the essential character and planned appearance of the area contrary to the aims of Policy 57 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No. 2 with Alterations 1996.

2. The two storey nature of the proposal, by reason of its depth, height and relationship to number 88 and the terrace of 5 dwellings adjacent dwellings, would result in an

unacceptably dominating and over bearing addition specifically in relation to No 88 and 90. These properties would be rendered gloomy and the proposal would appear overbearing from the rear aspect of both. To a lesser but nonetheless material degree, this impact would be manifest at the other properties in the terrace. This would amount to poor design and occasion harm to the reasonable living conditions and amenities of neighbours. The application proposal amounts to poor design in this regard and therefore fails to comply with the provisions of Policy 57 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan no.2 with Alterations 1996 and Section 7 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 acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant in an attempt to narrow down the reasons for refusal but fundamental objections could not be overcome. 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  Tom Rea Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 11 April 2018	