## WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL DELEGATED REPORT

| APPLICATION No: | S6/2009/555/FP |
|-----------------|----------------|
|                 |                |

### **NOTATION:**

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

## **DESCRIPTION OF SITE:**

The site at 46 Bluebell Way consists of a detached two storey dwelling house which is finished in red brick and is located within a cul-de-sac. The front garden measures approximately 4.7 metres deep by 8 metres wide with a rear garden measuring approximately 11 metres deep by 10 metres wide. The property consists of an integral garage which uniforms the majority of properties within the area.

The property is part of a larger development of dwellings built on the aerodrome site at the same time to varying designs but in a similar style.

## **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

The proposed development would involve the conversion of an existing garage to form a habitable accommodation. Internal alterations would be carried out to accommodate an increase to the existing kitchen and create a new study area. It is proposed that the area where the garage door currently stands will be bricked up and that one large window measuring approximately 2.3 metres in width by 1.3 metres high will be instated in the new section of wall.

## **PLANNING HISTORY:**

None relevant

# SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES:

National Policy PPS1: Delivering sustainable development PPG13: Transport

East of England Plan 2008 SS1: Achieving Sustainable Development

Hertfordshire Structure Plan Review 1991 – 2011: None 43: Landscape Conservation Regions

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
D5: Design for movement
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**

No comments were raised

### REPRESENTATIONS

None. Period expired. 24 April 2009

### **DISCUSSION:** The main issues are:

- 1. The proposed developments impact upon the character and appearance of the locality.
- 2. The proposal's impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers
- 3. Impact on Parking Standards
- 4. Other Material Considerations

1. The character of Bluebell Way is characterised by the presence of detached properties with the majority consisting of integral garages and driveways. The applicant is applying to convert the garage into a habitable accommodation. The proposed conversion would involve the removal of the existing garage door and the instalment of an additional window at the front of the property. The proposed development would be the first within Bluebell Way to convert their garage. The surrounding streets around Bluebell Way have over recent years seen some properties receive planning permission for the conversion of a garage to a habitable room; however, each application is dealt with on their own merits. The existing hardsurfacing for parking a vehicle measures approximately 2.9 metres in width by approximately 5.4 metres in depth with the addition of an adjacent existing footpath that measures approximately 1.5 metres in width providing access to the front entrance door. The existing driveway would allow one family sized car to be parked with enough sufficient space to manoeuvre to and from the vehicle. The proposed development would not extend forward of the existing front elevation and would not encroach onto the existing hard surface. The proposed window design would have appropriate proportions in relation to the existing windows on the front elevation of the application dwelling. It is considered that although the proposed removal of the garage door and the instalment of the additional window would change the current view of the property it would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the street scene.

2. The impact on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings is measured in terms of privacy and overshadowing. The proposed development proposes the installation of a window to the front of the property. It is considered that the window would not have an impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties. It is also considered that the proposed development will not have an impact on neighbouring properties access to sunlight and daylight.

3. Parking standards maps for the Hatfield Aerodrome site have not been developed, however it is anticipated that the site would contain areas of Zone 3 and Zone 4 parking restraint. The garage conversion would result in the loss of one designated parking space, with one additional space left on site which was identified during the site visit. By estimating the parking standards and designating the particular area of the development to be a Zone 3 or 4. Having spoken to the applicant over the phone, it was confirmed that the property is a four bed dwelling and therefore in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Guidance for Parking Standards the development would come under zone 4 which requires space for 3 vehicles to be available.

The application dwelling would retain one off road space on the drive to the front of the property. The application site is located on a private road which provides a minor route providing access to approximately four properties. It is considered that parking on road would create a possible congestion problem within this small cul-de-sac. Following my site visit it was noted that a few vehicles were parked within the private road, if the applicant also parks on the road the neighbours at numbers 44 and 42 would find it difficult gaining access to and from there driveways. The applicant provided a site plan showing the boundaries incorporating part of the private road, this you would assume also would apply to the neighbours opposite at number 40. The applicant raised the issue that they owned this part of the road and therefore should be included within there allowed parking space allocation. However, this would also apply to the neighbours within the cul-de-sac and therefore consideration must be taken on whether if they converted their garages this would restrict the flow of traffic to an from the sites within the cul-de-sac. It would be considered that this proposal would have the potential to create parking problems within this small private cul-de-sac as parking space on road would be limited. When considering the parking of vehicles from other properties within the cul-de-sac this could impact on highway safety. Parking facilities are to be located so that they do not dominate the surroundings or development and therefore should be located and designed so they are an integral part of the development of the residential site, these facilities should not visually detract from the locality or impede pedestrians, cyclists or vehicle movements and for these reasons I am recommending a refusal.

It is considered that the proposed development would not retain the sufficient provision of parking space and would be contrary to the requirements of Policy M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the supplementary Planning Guidance Parking Standards 2008.

## 4. Chalk Mining

The risk assessment for this development, using the tool by Hyder, indicates a very low risk. The application should therefore, in accordance with PPG14, include an informative/condition for:

Very Low Risk Sites - Informative\* and notes on back of decision notice

## **CONCLUSION:**

It is considered that the proposed development, by virtue of its scale, design and location would not have a significant impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings. Furthermore it is considered that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling house and the surrounding area, to an extent that would warrant refusal. However, it is also considered that the proposed development would not enable sufficient access to car parking space.

# **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL AND REASON (S)**

The proposal by virtue of the loss of the existing garage parking space would result in the dwelling only having one off street car parking space. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance for Parking Standards 2004.

## **INFORMATIVES:**

None

**REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS:** 1:200 Site Location Plan & 1:100 Existing and Proposed Elevations & 1:100 Existing and Proposed Floor Plan

Signature of author..... Date.....