

Addendum and Update to Committee Report

Item 8. 24/01489/FPH 68 Chiltern Road, Baldock SG7 6LS

Comments on behalf of the Applicant

Comments have been received on behalf of the applicant identifying errors in the report to Committee and making submissions in support of the proposal.

The Comments received include the following:

- No extension of time has been agreed.
- Regarding 4.1.1 of the report, the street scene is not relatively Uniform with 4 different house types in the vicinity.
- There is no need to refer to impact upon neighbours at 4.3.1 because there would not be any impact.
- Regarding 4.3.3 the building is the same height front to back – it will always be 3.16m high. There is a slight slope, but at the front, the building will be built into the ground and at the back the levels will be made up.
- Regarding 4.3.4 the property is located in a dip, the side element would only be viewable from within 30m of the property when approaching from the south. The attached semi-detached property has also had a hip-to-gable loft extension. There are many other flat-roofed extensions on the rear elevations, visible from the street including the flat-roofed extension on number 70. The property is at the end of this house type as the house type changes to a newer style of building.
- The rear elevation would have black charred timber – no modern materials would be used in this application. Number 66 attached to 68 Chiltern Road has been extended with hip to gable. Planning has also been granted for a hip-to-gable conversion on 39 Chiltern Road.
- The proposed dormer would be black charred timber.
- Regarding 4.3.8 –rear extension would be 4.1m deep
- The extension would be set off from the neighbouring property by 0.6m.
- Regarding 4.3.13 – disagree with the term substantial hardstanding as this implies a concrete slab or paving. A Ground Guard system is proposed utilising gravel and grass as we want it to be a permeable surface.

Clarification and amendments to the report

The Officer recommendation is unchanged. The attached dwelling, No. 66 has been altered and extended. Concern is not raised to the hip to gable element of the proposal, which would assist in rebalancing the pair of semi-detached dwellings. It is considered that the design of the side element and front porch would depart from the existing appearance of the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the street scene and there would be conflict with Local Plan Policy D1.

Regarding 4.3.5 of the report, it is confirmed that the proposed external materials on the dormer window and rear/side extension would be black charred timber cladding and not the black cementitious cladding or composite cladding stated.

It is confirmed that it is considered that there would not be an unacceptable impact upon the living conditions of neighbours. The rear extension has been reduced from 4.25m to 4.1m deep and there would be an offset from the boundary by 0.6m with No.70.

The applicant has provided details of the Air Source Heat Pump which would emit a noise output of 41.0dB for the nearest neighbouring dwelling, as this sits below the allowance under permitted development, Environmental Health (noise) have not raised any objections.

It is confirmed that no objections are raised to the proposed parking area.

The recommend reason for refusal is amended to the following:

The proposed alterations to the host dwelling, by virtue of their contemporary form and appearance, would not be sympathetic to the traditional character and appearance of the existing property and the wider area, such that the development does not respond positively to the site's local context. Therefore, the proposed development is considered contrary to Policies D1, D2 of the Local Plan, as well as section 12 of the NPPF.