DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Sam Dicocco.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/00229/FPH	Two storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory.	21 Pipit Close Royston Hertfordshire SG8 7XY

Submitted Plan Nos

PL-01 Rev A; PL-02; PL-03; SU-01 Rev B; SU-02 Rev A

1.0 Policies

LP28	House Extensions

LP57 Residential Guidelines and Standards

SECT7 Requiring Good Design

2.0 Site History

2.1 None.

3.0 Representations

3.1 33 Nightingale Way – Objection based on value of property; privacy and enjoyment of garden; intrusive; noise; blocking shared access during construction; flooding; spoil the overall 'look' of the Street; no longer a 'staggered terraced property' and 'stick out like a sore thumb'; No.33 Nightingale Way would look like a 'squashed in terrace' rather than the semi-detached property that it is.

4.0 Planning Considerations

4.1 Site and Surroundings

4.1.1 The site contains an end of terrace two storey dwelling hosting a pitched roof with gabled flank elevation. The dwelling currently enjoys a single storey conservatory extension to the rear. The dwelling also hosts a front porch with a lean-to roof. The dwelling is spaced from No.33 Nightingale Way by a shared access path.

4.1.2 The site surroundings are residential in nature. The surroundings comprise a mix of terraced and semi-detached dwellings with staggered front and rear elevations. The host dwelling is set back approximately 2m from the adjoining terraced property to the south (No.23 Pipit Close), and approximately 1.9m from the detached adjoining property to the north (No.33 Nightingale Way).

4.2 Proposal

4.2.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of a two storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The two storey rear extension would host a pitched roof with rear facing gabled elevation, and have a depth of approximately 3.5m. The rear extension would be near to the full width of the existing dwelling.

4.3 Key Issues

4.3.1 The addition would be sympathetic to the existing dwelling. Whilst the addition would be large, its positioning to the rear of the existing two storey dwelling means it would have no impact on the character of the street. The addition would be subservient to the existing dwelling in terms of its height, with a much lower ridge height than the existing building. The window detailing to the rear would respect the detailing of the windows within the existing building, albeit with one opening as opposed to the existing two at

first floor level. The material would match the existing building, and the extensions form would be sympathetic to the existing gabled elevations in the host building and surrounding area.

4.3.2 It is acknowledged that the neighbour representation suggests that the addition would spoil the overall 'look' of the street, result in the host property no longer looking like a 'staggered terraced property' and would 'stick out like a sore thumb', however, the addition would still be show a stagger in rear elevations, albeit reversed, and would not be apparent within the street scene.

4.3.3 It is considered that the two storey rear extension would distinguishably alter the relationship between dwellings in regards to living conditions. As previously discussed, the adjoining properties to the north and south of the host dwelling project approximately 2m from the existing rear wall of the host dwelling. The proposed 3.5m deep two storey addition would extend approximately 1.5m past the rear wall of the adjoining properties. It is not considered that this projection would appear unduly dominant. This consideration is further justified by the nearest first floor rear facing windows of the adjoining properties being obscured glazed. Furthermore, the loss of light resultant from the addition would be largely indiscernible by reason of the limited projection of the addition beyond the rear wall of the adjoining properties. It is not considered that the single rear window 3.5m further to the rear than the existing two rear windows would fundamentally alter levels of privacy in the rear gardens of adjoining properties.

4.3.4 The concerns expressed within the neighbour representation are acknowledged, however, for the reasons given above, it is not considered that the extension would be intrusive or alter the levels of privacy afforded in the rear garden. I cannot reconcile how the proposed addition could worsen any existing flooding issues at neighbouring properties. The discharge of runoff falling upon the property would be controlled and discharged appropriately. I am also at odds with the suggestion that the extension would cause noise issues, as the addition would remain in its existing residential use.

4.3.5 Other concerns, relating to the impact of the additions on land/property values and the impact of building works on shared access are not material planning considerations. Any blocking of a shared access during construction is a private matter between land owners.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 The addition would be sympathetic to the existing dwelling, maintain the character of the sites surroundings and respect the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining premises. Accordingly, the proposal accords with relevant planning policies within the local development framework.

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  Tom Rea Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 23 March 2018	