WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL **DELEGATED REPORT**

APPLICATION No: S6/2007/1783/FP

NOTATION:

The site lies within a specified settlement as designated in the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

The site comprises a detached bungalow on the eastern side of The Meadway. The area is dominated by bungalows of slightly varying designs, principally where they have been extended historically.

There is a slight change in land levels from the south to the north (increasing) and to the rear garden, land significantly drops.

The bungalow has been previously extended with a garage to the side and conservatory to the rear. It would appear that these have been undertaken under permitted development rights.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

The proposal seeks full planning permission to extend the ridge to the south to enable an additional dormer to be sited in the front plane of the building, a hipped roof over the garage - the existing would be demolished and a new garage built in front of the existing in line with the southern front boundary. To the rear, the existing conservatory would be demolished to enable a two storey rear extension to be built across the rear/side. To the northern rear/side, a single storey extension is proposed with a flat roofed dormer proposed within the roof space

PLANNING HISTORY:

None

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES:

National Policy

PPS1: Delivering sustainable development

PPG13: Transport

Hertfordshire Structure Plan Review 1991 – 2011:

None

Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005:

SD1 Sustainable Development

GBSP2 - Towns and specified settlements

R3 - Energy Efficiency

M14 - Parking standards for new developments

D1 - Quality of design

D2 - Character and context

D8 - Landscaping

Welwyn Hatfield District Plan, Supplementary Design Guidance, February 2005 Welwyn Hatfield District Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance, Parking Standards, January 2004

CONSULTATIONS

None

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Difficult to sustain an objection – PC are sure due regard will be given to concern of light deprivation by adjoining occupier.

REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of objection has been received; expiry of notification is 14th January. Objection relates to loss of light to flank elevation.

DISCUSSION:

The main issues are:

- 1. Impact of the proposal on the character of the area and the existing dwelling
- 2. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers
- 3. Highway and Parking Matters
- 4. Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact of the proposal on the character of the area and the existing dwelling Policy D1 requires the design of proposals to be of a high quality. The design of the

extensions reflect the character of the existing dwelling and maintain the integral character of the original building. The design of the roof to the front elevation, by reducing the ridge line above the garage maintains a sense of openness and prevents a terracing effect.

To the rear, the alterations result in a greater change to the appearance of the dwelling. However, these are still such that the overall scheme is in keeping with the existing dwelling and character of the area. More evidence of changes to dwellings can be seen to dwellings to the rear compared to the front.

With regards to the two new dormer windows, the dormer to the front is designed to reflect the design and scale of the existing dormer and with the increased width of the ridge/roof, is considered to meet the aims of the design guidance. The dormer to the rear is bulkier spanning the whole of the width of the roof (between the two storey extension and the flank elevation. The bulk of this, notwithstanding that it set some distance from the ridge of the roof, is considered to be detrimental to the overall appearance of the dwelling to the rear.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

The development is located, on the whole to the southern elevation and therefore has more impact on number 11 The Meadway. The small rear extension and dormer window, adjacent to number 15 are considered to be at a sufficient distance away from the boundary and of limited depth that amenity currently enjoyed would not be significantly impacted upon.

The extension to the side of the dwelling to provide the garage is considered by virtue of its proximity to the boundary and by virtue of being brought forwards compared to the existing garage would impact upon the amenity of number 11. This dwelling (11), to the flank elevation adjacent to number 13 has a bedroom to the front, a small bedroom behind this, then a bathroom and finally kitchen. The front bedroom has windows facing the front and the kitchen, windows to the rear and it is therefore considered that the proposal would not impact upon the amenity to either of these two rooms.

The bathroom, by virtue of being classified as a non-habitable room is less easy to protect in terms of daylight. However, the second bedroom already suffers from a lack of light due to the landscaping on the boundary and it is considered that the proposed garage, notwithstanding the hipped roof, would detrimentally impact upon the amenity enjoyed and is thus contrary to policy D1 due to its height and proximity to the boundary. The two storey element, due to its location towards the rear of the dwelling is considered would not be detrimental to amenity.

Highway and Parking Matters

The proposal would retain the same number of bedrooms as currently exists in the dwelling (3). However, although a garage is shown on the plans, replacing the existing, it is considered by virtue of the proposed dimensions 2.3 x .4.4 metres (manoeuvrable space) that this is below the required parking space standards and would therefore not contribute towards parking provision.

The application form does not require the number of parking spaces to be indicated, however the block plan identifies two on the plan and it would appear that a third could be provided to the front. The guidelines indicate that within a zone 4 area, 2.25 spaces are required and the proposal therefore complies with policy M14.

Other Material Planning Considerations

The application does not indicate how it will contribute towards sustainable development or renewable energy.

CONCLUSION:

The proposal, by virtue of its proximity to the common boundary with number 11 The Meadway would result in a detrimental impact to the amenity of occupiers of that dwelling which is contrary to the aims and provision of policy D1. The rear dormer by virtue of its width is considered to not be subservient to the roof and also contrary to policy D1.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL AND REASON (S)

- 1. The proposed side extension by virtue of its proximity to the common boundary with number 11 The Meadway would result in an unacceptable loss of residential amenity currently enjoyed by occupiers of that dwelling due to the significant loss of daylight and outlook to the existing side window of a ground floor bedroom of this neighbouring dwelling. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the design standards required by policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the accompany Supplementary Design Guidance, February 2005 and Planning Policy Statement 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development), both of which seek to achieve good quality design which respects the environmental amenity for both existing and new developments.
- 2. The proposed rear dormer by virtue of its width is considered to not be subservient or in proportion to the fenestration of the dwelling and so contrary to the requirements of policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and Supplementary Design Guidance, February 2005 and the design requirements of Planning Policy Statement 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development).

DRAWING NUMBERS:

PL010 & PL011 received and date stamped 23 November 2007

INFORMATIVE

1. For information, the internal dimensions of the garage as shown on drawing PL011 does not meet the minimum parking space standards and would provide insufficient area for the parking of cars.

Signature of author	Date