DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...Tom Donovan.....

APPLICATION REFERENCE	BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT	APPLICATION SITE
18/01406/FPH	Raise existing roof ridge height and insertion of rear dormer window and two front velux windows to facilitate loft conversion.	38 York Road Hitchin Hertfordshire SG5 1XB

Submitted Plan Nos

HM-17492-01 HM-17492-02B

1.0 Policies

1.1 **North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No.2 with Alterations**

Policy 28 - House Extensions
Policy 55 - Car Parking Standards

1.2 **National Planning Policy Framework.**

Section 7 - Requiring good design

1.3 **Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031 (Approved by Full Council 11th April 2017).**

D1 - Sustainable Design;
D2 – House extensions and replacement dwellings;
D3 – Protecting living conditions;
T2 - Parking

1.4 **Supplementary Planning Document**

Vehicle Parking at New Development September 2011

2.0 **Site History**

2.1 Permission granted (18/00226/FPH) for a variation on this application.

3.0 **Representations**

3.1 **Local residents**
No representations received.

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

4.1.1 38 York Road is a semi-detached residential property.

4.2 **Proposal**

4.2.1 Ridge extension, insertion of flat roof rear dormer window, insertion of roof lights to rear elevation and replacement tiles to roof to facilitate conversion of loft into habitable accommodation.

NB. The scheme has been amended during the application process to remove the rear dormer projection from the scheme.

4.3 **Key Issues**

4.3.1 The key issues for consideration are as follows:
--The acceptability of the design of the proposed extension and its resultant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
--The impact the proposed development would have on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
--The impact that the proposed development would have on car parking in the area.

4.3.2 Policy 28: Design and appearance
Saved Policy 28 suggests that house extensions are generally acceptable providing they are *"...sympathetic to the existing house in height, form, proportions, window details and materials..."* and *"...pitched roofs are used where appropriate..."*

Emerging Policy D2 is largely consistent with Saved Policy 28 although I attach limited weight to policies contained within the Emerging Local Plan at this stage.

4.3.3 The proposed extension scheme would involve an increase to the height of the ridge and a fairly significant flat roof dormer window to the rear that would extend onto the roof of the original two storey rear projection.

4.3.4 Previously I commented (app. 18/00226/FPH) that the increase to the ridge height and the main part of the flat roof dormer window (the part that sits on the rear rooflsope of the main house) would be acceptable on balance, although I negotiated the further flat roof dormer/roof extension to the two storey projection out of the scheme.

4.3.5 I maintain the view that this additional flat roof extension above the two storey rear projection would fundamentally alter the design and character of the property and would disrupt its form. Moreover, combined with the extension to the ridge height and the rear flat roof dormer window previously permitted, the extension scheme would not be sympathetic to the existing house in terms of their height, form, or proportions whilst the formation of a significant flat roof element would be contrary to Policy 28 of the Saved Local Plan and Policy D2 of the Emerging Local Plan.

4.3.6 The bulk of the proposal would be hidden from public view and this is certainly a consideration worth taking into account. However, Saved Policy 28 does not reference 'public impact' but rather is more concerned with the quality of the design and the relationship with the host property. My view on this matter is that design that is intrinsically harmful to the character of a building should thereby considered to be harmful to the wider character or appearance of the area.

4.3.7 With regards to the Framework paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for design that fails to improve the character of the area and the way that it functions. In line with my considerations in paragraphs 4.3.3-4.3.6 of this report I consider that the proposal would not improve the character of the area and should therefore be refused on this basis.

4.3.8 Impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties
The key issue for consideration is the impact that the proposed development would have on the living conditions of the adjoining and adjacent properties.

4.3.9 In my view the proposed development would not cause any material harm to the living conditions of either the adjoining or adjacent properties. New windows are proposed but these would face into the rear of the application site and would not result in a loss of privacy.

4.3.10 Car parking
The proposed development would not trigger the requirement for additional car parking to be provided within the application site.

4.4 **Conclusion**

4.4.1 By way of its height, form and proportions the proposed development would not be

a sympathetic addition and would therefore be contrary to Saved Policy 28 and Emerging Policy D2. Moreover, the proposal would fail to improve the character of the area or the way it functions contrary to paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4.5 **Alternative options**

4.5.1 N/A.

5.0 **Recommendation**

5.1 That planning permission is **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. By way of its height, form and proportions the proposed ridge height extension together with the insertion of a rear dormer window and roof extension would not be a sympathetic addition and would therefore be contrary to Policy 28 of the North Hertfordshire District Local Plan No.2 with Alterations and Policy D2 of the North Hertfordshire Emerging Local Plan 2011-2031. Moreover, the proposal would fail to improve the character of the area or the way it functions contrary to paragraph 64 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 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 (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: 11 July 2018	