

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**  
**DELEGATED REPORT**

**APPLICATION No:** S6/2015/1026/FP

**SITE ADDRESS:** 95 Bramble Road Hatfield AL10 9SB

**DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT:** Erection of a front porch and two storey side extension and ground floor rear extension

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

---

**1. SITE AND APPLICATION DESCRIPTION:**

The site contains a two storey semi detached dwelling hosting a hipped roof with an existing, flat roofed single storey side garage. The plot of the dwelling is located on a corner of Bramble Road, and as such has a segment shape, with a wide plot entrance from the street, narrowing to a point to the rear. The street scene has a fair level of symmetry, with a consistent nature of two storey semi or semi-link detached dwellings with hipped roofs hosting single storey elements to the side of varying roof types, largely flat roof.

The proposal is to build above the existing ground floor side extension at first floor level flush to the front and rear wall of the original dwelling. The first floor side extension would present a hipped roof. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension with a lean-to roof type covering the full width of the resultant dwelling to a depth of 4m with a maximum height of 4m and a height of eaves of 2.8m. Alongside these additions, a porch is sought with a height of 3.7m, width of 2.3m and depth of 1m. The porch will present a hipped roof style.

**2. SITE DESIGNATION:**

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

**3. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

None

**4. CONSULTATIONS:**

No objections have been received in principle from Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Landscaping and Ecology.

**5. NEIGHBOUR REPRESENTATIONS:**

One representation has been received from the public which may be summarised as:

What length of pipe if any will be replaced as it is likely building work will impact on the drainage system?

Are there any proposed changes to the fence between 95 and 97 Bramble Road?

Rainwater discharge into the foul drainage system?

Where will the boiler flue discharge be located?

What will the finish of the side elevation wall be?

## **6. TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL REPRESENTATIONS**

No representations have been received from the Town/Parish Council.

## **7. MAIN PLANNING ISSUES AND RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:**

The main planning issues with this application are:

- a) Whether or not the scheme incorporates high quality design in accordance with the principles of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan (2005) and relates to the character and context of the area (D1, D2, Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF))
- b) The impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of the adjoining properties (D1 and Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG))

## **8. ANALYSIS:**

- a) Local Plan Policies D1 and D2, alongside the SDG, seek to ensure a high quality of design which relates to the character and context of the dwelling and surrounding area. The policies require extensions to complement and reflect design and character, be subordinate in scale, and not look cramped within the site in regards to bulk. These policies are in line with the NPPF section 7 in that planning should require good design.

As mentioned within the site description, the street scene is consistent in its nature of semi and semi-link detached properties with single storey ground level garages to the side. There are some exceptions to this in the locality, specifically No. 101 Bramble Road which gained approval for a first floor side extension over the existing garage in 1987 (S6/1987/0382/FP). The policies to which this application is being assessed came into effect from 2005 onwards.

The plot on which the host dwelling sits is unique within the proximity due to the properties siting on a corner of Bramble Road. The plot has a segment shape with a wide plot to the front narrowing to a point to the rear. This gives the property more space within the plot than surrounding properties, as evidenced by sufficient space to extend to the extent of the single storey garage without coming within the expected 1m spacing at first floor level between the development and the flank boundary. Whilst the proposed first floor addition will add bulk to the dwelling, due to the shape of the plot and spacing left between the first floor addition and the flank boundary the resultant property would not look cramped within its setting.

The proposed first floor side addition sits flush with the front and rear wall of the original dwelling and presents a hipped roof with matching ridge and eaves height. As a result of the matching height and flush alignment to the host dwelling, the first floor addition cannot be considered subordinate to the host dwelling. The design of the first floor side extension is reflective of the host dwelling and surrounding area in terms of its roof type, construction and finishing materials as well as the design, location and size of fenestration detailing.

Within the SDG it is stated that “the spacing of buildings adjacent to and in the locality of the site should be reflected”. When discussing multi-storey side extensions this point is re-iterated in that “it is important that existing spacing in the street scene is reflected which may result in larger distances ... (than the 1m suggested) ... being required. The plot of the site is unique within the street scene, giving enough width to extend to the extent of the single storey garage without coming within the expected 1m spacing at first floor level between the development and the flank boundary. However, this extension would not reflect the spacing required within other existing multi-storey side extensions within the street scene and more importantly, those that may be proposed/required in properties within the street scene in the future. As a result, I recommend that in this case, a distance further than 1m between the extension and the flank boundary would be required for the proposal to be considered reflective of the design and character of the street scene.

Accordingly, it is considered that the first floor side extension is insufficiently designed and would result in an overly dominant addition which would be spaced in a fashion which would not reflect the spacing in the street scene.

The single storey rear extension would be to the rear of the existing two storey dwelling as well as the two storey side extension. Due to the location and unique shaping of the plot, the side of this rear extension would be viewable from some vantage points within the street scene. The extension would present a lean-to roof with a depth of 4m, a maximum height of 4m and a height of eaves of 2.8m. Whilst the roof type is not directly reflective of the host dwelling, the impact of this unreflective nature is mitigated by the location of the extension to the rear of the dwelling. The fenestration design in terms of location and spacing would not relate to those present in the first floor to the rear. Notwithstanding this a more relaxed approach can be taken as these details are indiscernible from the street scene. The rear extension is at ground floor level only, and by virtue of its scale and location remains subordinate to the host dwelling.

The porch hosts a hipped style roof which is reflective of the host dwelling. The porch is subordinate in its nature and will not add a level of bulk that would result in the dwelling looking cramped within its site. Accordingly, the porch and rear extension would, when considered individually, accord with design policies.

When considered as a whole, the proposal fails to comply with 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 in terms design. The reasons for the failure to comply with said policies could be summarised as the over-dominant nature of the first floor side extension which would fail to reflect the existing spacing within the street scene.

- b) With regard to the impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours, policy D1 and the SDG states that any extension should not cause loss of light or appear unduly dominant from an adjoining property. The impact of the proposed development should be assessed in regard to loss of day/sun/sky light, whether it is overbearing and will impact on outlook from an adjoining property.

No. 97 Bramble Road is located to the north west of the host dwelling, along the flank boundary to which the first floor side addition is located. The hipped roof of the proposed extension will serve to mitigate loss of light. Due to the spacing available between the first floor addition and the boundary of the site, alongside the siting and orientation of the properties, the first floor addition will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of No.97 Bramble Road in terms of loss of light or undue dominance. The rear facing window on the first floor side extension, due to the orientation of the properties, will overlook the garden of No.97. The additional proximity of the window to the boundary of the dwelling is not considered to impact the neighbouring property in terms of additional loss of privacy over that already affected by the existing first floor rear windows.

Whilst the ground floor rear extension would extend nearer to the boundary shared with No.97 Bramble Road, the limited height of this extension and distancing between the extension and any windows of No.97 serving habitable space result in the addition not having a detrimental impact in terms of loss of light, undue dominance or loss of privacy.

In regards to the impact of the proposed development on No. 93 Bramble Road, the ground floor rear extension will run along the boundary shared between the properties.

## **9. CONCLUSION:**

## **10. CONDITIONS:**

1. C.2.1 - Time limit for commencement of development
2. C.13.1 - Development in accordance with approved plans and details xx received and dated xx
3. C.5.2 – Matching materials or C.5.1 – Samples of materials

## **SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE GRANT OF PERMISSION:**

The decision has been made taking into account, where practicable and appropriate the requirements of paragraphs 186-187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and 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

## **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 XX received and dated XX

## **INFORMATIVES:**

None

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