

WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION No:	S6/ 2010/0995/FP
------------------------	-------------------------

NOTATION:

The site lies within the former Hatfield Aerodrome site as designated in the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

The application dwelling is an end of terrace house, which is linked to another terrace by attached garages to the east. The application dwelling is two-storey with accommodation within the roofspace. The adjacent property to the west is a townhouse, which has a single storey rear conservatory. The application dwelling is sited on a modern development and plot shapes and sizes are relatively uniform, with modest amenity spaces.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

The proposed conservatory would measure 5.2m in width by approximately 3.6m in depth. The proposal would have a lean-to design with a maximum roof height of approximately 2.9m.

PLANNING HISTORY:

S6/2002/0967/FP – Erection of 46 dwellings. (amendments to planning approval ref. S6/1999/971/FP) – Approved.

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES:

National Policy
PPS1: Delivering sustainable development

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

CONSULTATIONS

HATFIELD TOWN COUNCIL COMMENTS

None received.

REPRESENTATIONS

None. Period expired 18 June 2010.

DISCUSSION:

The main issues are:

- 1. The proposed development's impact upon the character and appearance of the locality**
- 2. The proposed development's impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers**
- 3. Other Material Planning Considerations**

1. The proposed development would be sited to the rear of the property and would not be viewed within the surrounding public street scene. The occupants of neighbouring plots would have limited views of the proposal. The existing garage to the east of the application dwelling has the same depth as the proposal and would screen it from the adjacent property beyond the eastern boundary.

The adjacent property to the west (no 12) has an existing rear conservatory and a tall boundary fence. The proposal would have a similar depth to the existing neighbouring conservatory and would be mostly screened from the main habitable areas of number 12. The proposed conservatory would be slightly set off the boundary with number 12, which would help offset the depth of the proposal when viewed from the neighbouring property. The occupants of this neighbouring property would not suffer an adverse loss of residential amenity.

The proposal would be an appropriate size and have an appropriate design for a rear conservatory. The proposal would not appear prominent or out of place and would not have an adverse impact upon the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

2. The proposed conservatory would infill an area between the neighbouring properties existing single storey rear conservatory and the application dwelling's garage. Due to the siting of these existing structures and the existing boundary treatments, the proposal would be partly screened from the neighbouring properties.

The proposed conservatory would match the depth of the existing garage and have a lower roof height. Due to the proposal's distance from the main habitable areas of the adjacent property to the east (no 8), the depth and height of the proposal would not be noticeable and would not have an adverse impact upon the adjacent occupiers.

Number's 12 existing conservatory is a similar depth to the proposal. The fence between these properties and gap which both additions would maintain from the boundary would ensure that the occupants would not suffer adverse loss of residential amenity.

The proposal would be single storey and would have brick built side elevations. The extended dwelling would not result in any further overlooking or loss of privacy to the adjacent properties. A sufficient distance would be maintained from the properties beyond the rear boundary and the existing boundary treatment would screen the proposal.

The adjacent occupiers would therefore not suffer an adverse loss of residential amenity and the proposal would meet the requirements of Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

3. The proposed development would not result in the removal of any trees or hedges that are worthy of protection. A sufficient area of useable amenity space would be retained for the occupants of the application dwelling.

The application has been submitted with a sustainability checklist, which notes the conservatory would have insulated walls and glass rather than polycarbonate to maximise energy savings. Considering the proposal would be a single storey addition to an existing property, these provisions are considered to be a reasonable effort to meet the requirements of Policies SD1 and R3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

CONCLUSION:

The proposed conservatory would not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the locality or the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and would meet the relevant requirements of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

CONDITIONS:

1. C.2.1: Standard Time Limit
2. C.13.1: Development in accordance with approved plans/details Site Location Plan 1:1250 & 1:250 & Existing and Proposed Floor Plan & Existing and Proposed Side Elevation & Existing and Proposed Front and Rear Elevations & Existing and Proposed Roof Plan received and dated 20 May 2010.
3. C.5.1: Materials to Match

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE GRANT OF PERMISSION:

Reason for Grant of Full Planning Consent:

The proposal has been considered against Planning Policy Statement/Guidance PPS1 and development plan policies SD1, GBSP2, R3, M14, D1, D8 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, in addition to the Human Rights Act 1998, which indicate that the proposal should be approved. Material planning considerations do not justify a decision contrary to the Development Plan (see Officer's report which can be inspected at these offices).

INFORMATIVES: None.

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