

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION No: S6/2014/0960/FP

SITE ADDRESS: 45 Bramble Road, Hatfield

DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT: Erection of two storey side, part two storey and part single storey rear extensions

RECOMMENDATION: Refusal

1. SITE AND APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:

The application property is a semi-detached house which appears to date from the interwar period which, unusually, seems to be in an almost original condition. The house is on the southern side of a part of Bramble Road. The attached neighbour is to the west. To the east the houses splay away from the side boundary as Bramble Road turns a corner.

The proposal is for a two storey side extension which would project back past the existing rear wall of the house; a two storey side and rear extension forms part of the proposal. The side extension would accommodate a single garage at ground floor level (access to which would be via a pinch point some 2.5m wide suggesting that the garage would be more in the nature of an attached outbuilding). The two storey side and rear extension would be beneath a hipped roof which would be subservient in scale to the existing hipped roof. A single storey rear extension would be added at the rear of the house closest to the attached neighbour. The single storey rear extension would have a lantern style roof light in the middle of its flat roof. Two roof lights would be inserted on the rear roof slope and one roof light would be inserted on the side roof slope.

The proposal would create a garage and utility room and enable a larger kitchen/family room to be created on the ground floor; a large fourth bedroom with shower room en-suite would be created at first floor.

2. SITE DESIGNATION:

The site lies within the town of Hatfield and the Watling Chase Community Forest as designated in the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None.

4. CONSULTATIONS:

Not applicable.

5. NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS:

No representations have been received from the public.

6. TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received from the Town Council.

7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES AND RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

The main planning issues with this application are:

- a) The proposed development's impact upon the character and appearance of the locality (GBSP2, D1, D2, SDG 2005, NPPF paragraphs 56, 60 and 66)
- b) The proposed development's impact upon the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers (D2)
- c) Other matters (M14, D8, RA11)

8. ANALYSIS:

- a) The two storey side extension would have a setback of some 2.5m and the ridge of the roof above the two storey side extension would be set some 1.5m lower than the level of the existing main roof ridge. The side extension would be approximately half the width of the existing house, the extension would be some 3m wide and the existing house is some 5.7m wide. These features would go some way towards making the side extension subordinate in scale to the rest of the house and to ensure that the extension would not reduce the space around the dwelling to such an extent that the resulting dwelling would look cramped on the site. However, it is a longstanding requirement of the Council that two-storey extensions leave a minimum distance of 1m between the extension and the adjacent flank boundary. This spacing is to prevent over development across plot widths and to prevent the creation of a terracing effect.

The proposal fails to be of a high quality design by relating poorly to its surroundings in terms of failing to respect the pattern of built form and open space at first floor level between properties and as such does not maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan which seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which respects the character and context of the area. It would also conflict with the Council's SDG which states that 'extensions should be designed to complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling and be subordinate in scale'. The proposal would also be in conflict with the Framework which at paragraph 17 seeks to secure high quality design.

The proposed single storey rear extension would be similar to existing alterations to neighbouring properties and would be subordinate to the main dwelling. Although the original appearance of the property would be changed, these additions would not appear out of place or have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the locality.

- b) The two-storey side extension would be orientated to the southwest of the neighbour on the adjoining plot to the position of the side extension. The property to the northeast, no. 43, has a first floor side window but this appears to be to a staircase. The proposal for the application property would have its rear wall not as deep into its plot as the rearmost wall of no. 43, although the rear wall to no. 43 in question would be to a single storey element. The rear first floor windows are on a wall splayed away from the proposed extension.

Given the relationship between the application property and no. 43 it is considered that no material loss of light or material impression of enclosure would result. The arrangement whereby no. 43 is set out splayed away from the application property would also mean that no material loss of privacy would result from the rear first floor window proposed for the new bedroom. The single storey rear extension would project to about the same depth as a flat roofed single storey rear extension at the attached neighbour, no. 47, and accordingly would have no material adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers of no. 47. Furthermore, there is a screen fence on the boundary with the attached neighbour and a conifer hedge the neighbour's side of the fence.

- c) The application property is within Parking Standard Zone 3. Outside of zones 1 and 2 the maximum car parking standard for a house with 4 or more bedrooms is 3 spaces. SPG Parking Standards, adopted January 2008, states at paragraph 4.1 that residential development will generally be expected to accommodate all parking demand on site. The designation of the site within the Watling Chase Community Forest appears to be an anomaly for this specific site; the site offers very limited opportunities for landscaping.

9. CONCLUSION:

The extension, by virtue of its scale would fail to reflect the proportions of and be subordinate in scale to the original dwelling. The proposal is to a poor quality of design that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property.

10. REFUSAL:

The extension by virtue of its scale, form and design would fail to reflect the proportions of or be subordinate in scale to the original dwelling. The proposal would result in a visually over dominant addition to the dwelling which would not complement and reflect the design and character of the property and which would be detrimental to the character of the streetscene and wider area. Accordingly the proposal represents a poor standard of design that would be detrimental to the appearance of the property. As such the development would be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance, Statement of Council Policy 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework by representing a poor standard of design.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR REFUSAL

The decision has been made taking into account material planning considerations and where practicable and appropriate the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (see Officer's report which can be inspected at these offices).

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS:

Site Location Plan & BD/14/16/1 & BD/14/16/2B & BD/14/16/3A received and dated 6 May 2014

INFORMATIVES:

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