

DELEGATED FILE NOTE

CASE OFFICER: ...William Thompson.....

**APPLICATION
REFERENCE**

**BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF
DEVELOPMENT**

APPLICATION SITE

26/02011/FPH

Two storey and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear element. Alterations to fenestration including insertion of cellar lightwell.

76A High Street
Kimpton
Hertfordshire
SG4 8QW

Submitted Plan Nos

24011 - 001 24011 - 010B

1.0 Policies

D1 Sustainable design

D2 House exts, replcmnt dwellings outbuild

D3	Protecting living conditions
T2	Parking
SECN5	Meeting the challenge of Climate Change
SECN14	Achieving well-designed places

2.0 **Relevant Site History**

- 2.1 24/00852/FPH - Part three storey and part single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear element. Rear roof extension and insertion of two front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion. Alterations to fenestration

Refused

3.0 **Representations**

- 3.1 **Neighbour Consultation** – Two received in objection from no.74 and no.76 High Street:
- Concerns about design, size and siting and effect on locality.
 - Concerns about residential amenity: over-dominance, overlooking, loss of privacy, shading.
 - Concerns about parking
 - Concerns about construction management.
 - Concerns about bats
 - Concerns about hinderance to right of access (for bins)

- 3.2 **Kimpton Parish Council** – None received

4.0 **Planning Considerations**

4.1 **Site and Surroundings**

- 4.1.1 The application site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on High Street, Kimpton. Rear party boundaries are comprised of 1m to 1.8m high fences and higher vegetation. The site is in a residential area comprised predominantly of detached and semi-detached dwellings.

4.2 **Proposal**

- 4.2.1 Two storey and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing rear element. Alterations to fenestration including insertion of cellar lightwell.
- 4.2.2 This application seeks to address the reasons for refusal of the previously refused application under reference 24/00852/FPH by removing the second storey element from the proposed rear extension.

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 impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- The impact of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring properties.
- Access and parking matters.
- The impact of the proposed development on the environment.

Design and Appearance:

- 4.3.2 Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires that development proposals respond positively to the site's local context. Policy D2 of the Local Plan requires extensions to houses and outbuildings to incorporate a 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 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.3.3 The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 7.5m with an initial two-storey depth of 2.876m and the remaining at single storey. The design is slightly staggered to remain sufficiently offset from the adjoining neighbour (no.76). Both elements would have a dual pitched gable end roof form, incorporating 5no. rooflights. The bulk of the development is comparable to that of no.76 and is considered acceptable. The proposed external materials are set to match existing.
- 4.3.4 The proposal includes 2no. front rooflights, additional ground floor fenestration, a new cellar lightwell and a relocated external door. These are considered acceptable.
- 4.3.5 The proposal would be visible from the public realm. In my view, the proposal has addressed the previous reason for refusal and is considered to be acceptable in design terms and would, therefore, not cause harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or streetscene. The proposal is considered to comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the NHLP and Section 14 of the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties:

- 4.3.6 A core planning principle set out in the NPPF is to always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. This principle is reflected in the provisions of Policy D3 of the NHLP.
- 4.3.7 Regarding neighbour amenity, objections have been raised by no.74 and no.76 High Street regarding dominance, loss of privacy and shading. The proposed rear extension

is sufficiently off set from neighbouring boundaries with a minimum 2m offset from the boundary of no.74, the rooflights are high level, the two-storey element has a sufficiently reduced ridge height, has no first-floor side elevation windows and is limited in depth with the total bulk being comparable to that of no.76. The first-floor rear windows are unlikely to cause a material increase in overlooking over existing. The rear elevation windows of neighbouring properties are north northwest facing, so do not already receive optimal sunlight. An element of shading would increase; however, given the orientation of the dwellings and windows and the existing built form, this is considered to be acceptable. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable level of harm to amenity, as to be objectionable, in terms of overdominance, shading or loss of privacy.

- 4.3.8 This development is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy D3 of the NHLP and Section 14 of the NPPF.

Highways and Parking:

- 4.3.9 The development includes an increase in the number of bedrooms from 2no. to 3no. The site has no on-site parking, so already fails to comply with Policy T2 of the NHLP. On-street parking exists and the site is in a sustainable location, so this would not be a strong enough reason for refusal.

Environmental Implications

- 4.3.10 The proposed development is not large enough in scale to cause significant implications for the local environment in terms of carbon emissions and therefore would be generally in compliance with Section 5 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain:

- 4.3.11 This is a form of development which is exempt from BNG Legislation, defined under article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 due it falling under the scope of the 'de minimis' exemption.

Other Matters:

- 4.3.12 Concerns over the presence of bats has been raised by a neighbour representation. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing rear element, so a bat informative has been used.
- 4.3.13 Concerns over construction management has been raised by a neighbour representation. A proposal of this scale would not normally require a Construction Management Plan and I do not consider it prudent to condition this.
- 4.3.14 Concerns over a loss of the right of access through the garden of no.76a from no.76 has been raised. The proposed extension would hinder this right of access but would not block off the route entirely, with the option of going around the proposed extension. Nevertheless, this would remain a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.

4.4 Conclusion

4.4.1 In the absence of material planning reasons to the contrary it is my view that planning permission is **GRANTED**.

4.5 **Alternative Options**

4.5.1 N/A

4.6 **Pre-Commencement Conditions**

4.6.1 N/A

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 (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Signed <i>S. Kasparian</i> Sarah Kasparian	Development Management North Hertfordshire District Council Council Offices Gernon Road Letchworth Herts SG6 3JF
Determining Officer Date: 5 October 2026	