DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: …Richard Tiffin……

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01299/FP	Erection of two storey three-bedroom house adjoining 88 Maddles with associated works. Two storey rear extension to 88 Maddles.	88 Maddles Letchworth Garden City Hertfordshire SG6 2RL

Submitted Plan Nos
PL.001 PL.002 PL.003 PL.004A PL.005 PL.006 PL.007 PL.008A PL.009A

1.0 Policies

LP57	Residential Guidelines and Standards
SECT6	Delivering Wide Choice High Quality Home
SPDVP	Vehicle Parking at New Development
XD3	Protecting Living Conditions
SECT7	Requiring Good Design
SECT6	Delivering Wide Choice High Quality Home

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 Planning permission refused for a similar proposal under ref 18/00579/FP for the following reasons:

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.

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.

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 4m. A complicated roof design is specified such that the two storey form would comprise three ridge lines and a series of internal valley features presenting a front elevation to the footpath and not Maddles. The donor property would share part of the rear extension and remain 3 bedroom. The new dwelling would have two bedrooms. Parking for the new dwelling would be provided by two spaces on the front garden facing Maddles following the provision of new dropped kerb. No parking is shown for the three bedroom donor property. A relatively generous rear garden would is specified for both properties following the subdivision of the large garden serving No 88.

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 remain relatively generous and would not be an issue in my view.

4.3.2 The first planning concern with this scheme is the relationship the new dwelling would have with the other dwellings in the terrace. Being set back 4m it would present a full two storey blank elevation to no 89 dominating to some significant degree the rear aspect of this property. The dominance would be partially mitigated by the two storey flank being set in by 3m. However, the presence of a plain two storey flank elevation at 4m depth would occasion a significant change in the established aspect along the rear of terrace in my view.

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, in particular the specification of a new entrance to the side onto the grassed amenity strip. Of more concern is the accommodation of two car parking spaces which would dominate the front garden leaving little room for meaningful landscaping. Further, the specification of two parking spaces for the new two bed dwelling would remove any possibility of the occupier of the donor property servicing their three bed property with any car parking at all going forward. 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 might apply, I am firmly of the view the harm to the planned character of the area and the reasonable living conditions of neighbouring properties is, in combination, such that it significantly and demonstrably outweighs the modest benefits which might result from an additional two bed unit.

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 an existing terrace, the introduction of a side entrance door and the provsion of dominating front garden parking spaces , the proposal would occasion an undesirable subdivision of the existing curtilage of number 88 Maddles such that would result in an unacceptably cramped and visually discordant form of development as viewed from the street and adjacent properties. Moreover, the proposal would permanently deny the donor property the ability to provide any car parking within its curtilage. 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 provisions of Section 12 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.

Proactive Statement:

0. 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  Simon Ellis Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 25 July 2018	