

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Andrew Hunter.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
25/00435/FPH	Two storey and part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear element. Installation of rear and side entrance steps.	50 Grays Lane Hitchin Hertfordshire SG5 2HJ

Submitted Plan Nos

Location Plan HM-24661-01 HM-24661-02 HM-24661-03

1.0 Policies

D1	Sustainable design
D2	House exts, replcmnt dwellings outbuild
D3	Protecting living conditions
SECN12	Achieving well-designed places
SECN9	Promoting sustainable transport

SP6 Sustainable transport

T2 Parking

SP9 Design and Sustainability

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 None.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 None received.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 The site is a detached chalet bungalow with a pitched roof. Rear party boundaries are fences, vegetation and walls. Ground levels slope down towards the rear of the site. The site is in a residential area comprised of semi-detached and detached dwellings.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 The erection of a two and single storey rear extension with a flat roof which would replace an existing single storey rear projection, and new steps to the side of the extension in the rear garden. The number of bedrooms will be increased from three to four.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key material considerations are design, neighbour amenity, and parking.

Design

4.3.2 There are no objections to the new side steps. The proposed extension would be of a floorspace, footprint and size comparable to the host dwelling, and is considered to be a relatively large addition.

4.3.3 All parts of the extension would have a flat roof. There are no objections to the single storey part of the extension having a flat roof as this is a common form of design for such extensions, and would be lower than the eaves of the main roof.

4.3.4 The roof of the two storey larger part of the extension would also be flat, and would have higher eaves than the main roof. The proposed flat roof design and higher eaves

do not relate to the pitched roof design and character of the host dwelling, and is not considered sympathetic to the existing dwelling therefore not complying with a) of Local Plan Policy SP2. These impacts would be exacerbated by the relatively large size of the extension and its blank side walls.

- 4.3.5 The proposed extension would also have some visibility in the street scene as it would be visible above the lower sides of the main roof and through gaps between the host dwelling and its neighbours, and is considered harmful to the character and appearance of the locality. The design is not therefore acceptable. The proposal does not comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the adopted Local Plan, and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Neighbour amenity

- 4.3.6 The neighbouring dwelling to the east is No. 46, which is sited largely behind the rear of No. 50 albeit is set away from the boundary. The ground floor side of No. 46 comprises two clear glazed high level windows, and the first floor has one small clear glazed window which is considered secondary to a bedroom which has a front window.
- 4.3.7 The extension would be visible from the side of No. 46, however as the facing windows are small and secondary, as there would be a gap between the extension and No. 46, and as boundary treatment would largely obscure the ground floor of the extension, it's not considered overbearing or that it would cause loss of light.
- 4.3.8 The other neighbouring dwelling is No. 52 to the west. The extension would be closer to the boundary of No. 52, however its visual impacts would be substantially mitigated by No. 52 being set away from the boundary and as an outbuilding in the rear garden of No. 52 near the boundary would obscure some of the extension.
- 4.3.9 The extension would fill the gap between the rear of No. 52 and the front of its outbuilding. It's not however considered that this would be significantly more harmful than the existing relationship No. 50 has with No. 52 as there is presently only a small gap of approx. 1m, and the side of No. 50 that projects beyond the rear of No. 52 is part of the side wall of No. 50 that extends up to the main roof. It's not considered that the extension would be overbearing or cause loss of light to No. 52.
- 4.3.10 The extension includes a platform attached to its rear with steps leading down to the rear garden. The platform is however small at approx. 1m in depth to allow space for bi-fold doors of the extension to open onto, and would not be practicable for seating or sustained standing. Views of the neighbouring gardens would in any case be restricted by fencing and vegetation on the boundaries, and the outbuilding of No. 52. The rear steps are not considered harmful to amenity. Impacts on amenity are acceptable. The proposal complies with Policy D3 of the adopted Local Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Parking

- 4.3.11 The proposal annotates a study that could be used as a bedroom, therefore increasing the potential number of bedrooms from three to four. The site does however have parking for two cars, which complies with minimum standards and is acceptable. The proposal complies with Policy T2 of the Local Plan.

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**.

5.0 **Recommendation**

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

1. The proposed extension by reason of its design, size and siting would not be sympathetic to the dwelling and locality, causing harm to their character and appearance. The proposal does not comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the adopted Local Plan, and Section 12 of the NPPF.

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  Sam Dicocco Determining Officer	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Date: 10 April 2025	

