

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Thomas Howe.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
25/02874/FPH	First floor rear extension. Roof extension involving raising roof ridge height and insertion of two front and two rear roof lights to facilitate conversion of loft into habitable accommodation. Replacement roof with 2 no. roof lights to existing single storey rear element and raised parapet wall. (as amended by plans rec'd 15 January 2026).	19 Millard Way Hitchin Hertfordshire SG4 0QE

Submitted Plan Nos

1856 03 B 1856 01 B 1856 02 B

1.0 Policies

2.0 **Site History**

- 2.1 15/00217/1HH - Two storey side extension following demolition of existing garage and store and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory. – Conditional Permission

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Neighbour Representations –**

21 Millard Way – Objection:

- Poor design response and harm to host dwelling and surrounding area.
- Materiality would be out of place.
- Use of white render is out of place. Dilutes architectural character.
- Unsympathetic design.
- Harm to amenity.
- Impact upon enjoyment of home.
- Conflict with local plan policies D2 and D3.
- Harm to living conditions of neighbour.
- Depth of extension would increase massing on the boundary, harming outlook to the living room, bedroom and decking area.
- Sense of enclosure.
- Dominance.
- Inability to assess impacts from submitted plans.
- Recommends undertaking an assessment using BRE guidance with regards to daylight and sunlight.
- Seeks a site visit.

21 Millard Way – Objection:

- Amended scheme does not overcome concerns of amenity.
- Overbearing and dominating type of development.
- Harm to outlook from living room and master bedroom.
- Oppressive sense of enclosure to rear decking area.
- Loss of daylight and sunlight to rooms and amenity space.
- Seeks a BRE compliant daylight and sunlight assessment.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 No. 19 comprises a detached two storey dwelling off Millard Way, Hitchin.

- 4.1.2 Within the vicinity, dwellings benefit from extensions. However, No. 21 remains unextended. Other dwellings to the south benefit from single and two storey rear extensions. The existing dwelling benefits from a single storey flat roofed extension.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 Planning Permission is sought for:

- First floor rear extension.
- Roof extension involving raising roof ridge height and insertion of two front and two rear roof lights to facilitate conversion of loft into habitable accommodation.
- Replacement roof with 2 no. roof lights to existing single storey rear element and raised parapet wall. (as amended by plans rec'd 15 January 2026).

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 resultant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- The impact that the proposed development would have on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
- The impact that the proposed development would have on car parking provision in the area.
- The impact that the proposed development would have on the environment.

Design and Appearance:

4.3.2 Policy D1 of the Local Plan states that development will be granted provided the design of the development appropriately and positively responds to the site's local context together with other criteria to encourage a positive and sustainable form of development. Policy D2 of the Local Plan requires extensions to houses and the erection or replacement of buildings 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 alterations to the main roof of the dwelling, to increase its height and to introduce rooflights is noted. These would be visible from the street scene, and would alter the character of the dwelling. I do not consider that this change to its appearance would be significant or result in the dwelling appearing incongruous in the locality. The rear extension would be predominantly obscured from view from the public realm owing to its position to the rear, and the relative proximity of neighbouring dwellings providing a visual barrier. Neighbouring gardens would view the extension. It is noted concern is raised with regards the visual impacts of introducing render, however, given the existing use of render to the rear of the dwelling, and other dwellings nearby, I do not consider it is reasonable to object in this instance. The cumulative scale of the existing and proposed development is acknowledged. However, I consider that the plot can suitably host extensions of this size. In terms of the grain of development, the local area includes many extensions of varying sizes, with some similar in scale to the footprint proposed. Therefore, I consider that the local area and its grain of development suitably supports the scale and built form proposed.

4.3.4 The proposed development is therefore considered to be in compliance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan and the core principles set out within Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The design and appearance are therefore acceptable.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties:

- 4.3.5 Policy D3 of the Local Plan permits development that does not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and where necessary encourages the use of mitigation measures to reduce these impacts. This is generally reflected by the provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.3.6 The application site is neighboured to the south-east by No. 17 and to the north-west by No. 21. No. 17 benefits from a large two storey rear extension similar in depth to the proposed extension, and on the boundary with the application site, also featuring a rooflight to the side roof slope. Given the similarity in depth proposed, and its siting to the opposite boundary, I do not consider that the proposed extension would overbear or dominate this neighbour. Outlook from the extension is unlikely to look into windows or the curtilage to cause an adverse impact to privacy. The raised roof ridge and rooflights would not extend beyond the elevations of this neighbour, and are therefore unlikely to be significantly harmful. The increase in height to the parapet is not considered to be dominating given its lack of projection beyond the rear of this neighbour.
- 4.3.7 Turning to No. 21, the proposed rear extension would be sited on/close to the shared boundary with this neighbour. An amended scheme was received to reduce the first-floor depth of the extension in response to the original representations from No. 21. The proposed development would extend beyond the rear elevation of this neighbour by approximately 4m, and would be set off from this boundary. A hipped roof covers the extension and it would be covered in white render. It is noted that concerns are raised with regards the dominance of the extension, and a site visit to No. 21 observed the location of the development. Following consideration, it is considered that the proposed siting, height and depth of the rear extension would not unacceptably dominate this neighbour, with the set-in from the boundary to both sides, the hipped roof and the total depth sufficiently addressing concerns raised with regards the original scheme. The white render would allow for some reflection of ambient light towards this neighbouring property. The extension would have an impact upon outlook and light. The application site is to the south and south-east of this neighbour. Therefore, morning light may be lost to the windows and amenity space to the rear of this neighbour, and this is acknowledged. Given the relatively open angle of these dwellings, allowing for light into the neighbour for a majority of the day, I do not consider that a tunnelling effect or overshadowing impact would be unacceptable. The extension would not cause unacceptable harm to privacy.
- 4.3.8 Given the above, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable detrimental impact upon neighbouring occupiers to the extent that the living conditions of occupiers would be significantly harmed and is therefore compliant with Policy D3 of the local plan and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Highways and Parking:

- 4.3.9 The proposed development would be served by a minimum of two parking spaces that are off-street, therefore impacts to parking provision locally would not be harmful.

Environmental Implications:

- 4.3.10 The proposed development, by virtue of its limited scale in general terms together with the sustainable location would have no significant implications for the local environment in terms of carbon emissions and therefore would be generally in compliance with Section 14 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

- 4.3.11 This is a householder application which is exempt from BNG Legislation defined under article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

4.4 **Conclusion**

- 4.4.1 The proposed development is considered acceptable and is considered to comply with the necessary provisions of the Local Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework. Grant conditional permission.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

- 4.5.1 None applicable.

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. The Council acted proactively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. The Council has therefore acted proactively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed  Shaun Greaves Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 13 February 2026	