

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
DIRECTORATE OF STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT**

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2016/0038/HOUSE
Location: 6B Hill Rise, Cuffley, Potters Bar, EN6 4EE
Proposal: Retention of detached garage, and alterations to roof to reduce the height.
Officer: Ms M Saunders

Recommendation: Granted

6/2016/0038/HOUSE

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is located on the eastern side of Hill Rise near to its junction with Plough Hill.</p> <p>The host dwelling is two storey and is set within a spacious plot. There was a single garage on site which has been demolished and the application is for the retention of a double garage in a different location.</p> <p>The surrounding area is residential in character and the site is bounded on all sides by detached and semi-detached residential properties in Hill Rise and Orchard Close. The ground levels falls to the east of the site and therefore properties in Orchard Close are at a lower level. There is a single vehicular access to the site from Hill Rise.</p>		
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	The site lies within the specified settlement of Cuffley as designated within the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.		
Relevant planning history	<p>S6/2002/0470/FP - Partial demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two detached dwellings – Approved 11/04/2003</p> <p>S6/2004/0437/FP - Partial demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two detached dwellings and garages (amended scheme to S6/2002/0470/FP involving revisions to the size and height of the garages serving no.6 hill rise and new dwelling on plot 1) – Granted 04/06/2004</p> <p>S6/2005/0583/FP - Erection of a two storey rear extension – Approved 01/07/2005</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 1	Object: 3	Other:
Publicity	Neighbour letter		
Summary of neighbour	<u>First scheme</u>		

responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of natural daylight and privacy • Too close and overbearing • Difference in land levels between Orchard Close and Hill Rise • Appearance of two storey dwelling • Only 8m between rear elevation of 7 Orchard Close and the garage • Roof has overhanging feature <p><u>Revised scheme</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in height not acceptable • Too close to boundary • Concerns regarding boundary treatment • Consider the revised scheme is overdeveloped, creates overlooking and overshadowing • Still intrusive
Town / Parish representations	Northhaw and Cuffley Parish Council commented on the revised plans only and appear to favour the first scheme rather than the revised scheme.
Consultees and responses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jason Grocock – No response 2. Councillor George Michaelides – No response 3. Councillor John Nicholls – No response
Relevant Policies	
NPPF D1 D2 GBSP1 GBSP2 M14 Others	
Main Issues	
Is the development within a conservation area?	
Yes No	
Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be conserved or enhanced?	
Yes No Comment (if applicable):	
Would the development reflect the character of the area?	
Yes No Comment: Though the proposed garage is greater in bulk and mass than the previous single pitched roof garage, it is considered that the build, form and location of the garage does not result in a visually dominant or incongruous feature when viewed from the site and within the immediate streetscene. The garage is more visually dominant on properties in Orchard Close however this will be discussed later in the report. It is also considered that the proposed materials do not disrupt the harmony of the wider surrounding built form. Taking into account the above, although the proposal is more visually prominent than the previous garage on site, it is considered that the proposal does not result in significant harm to the character of the immediate streetscene and the visual interest of its surroundings. As such, the proposal is not contrary to policies D1 and D8.	
Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?	
Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Having regard to the above, and as the proposal would remain subordinate in build and form to the host property, it is considered that the development would not	

disrupt the character and design of the host property.

Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): The existing garage on site, as built, does not maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers due to its height and dominance. When viewed from the application site, at the highest point the ridge height is approximately 5.3 meters and the eaves height is approximately 2.6 meters.

Revised plans have been received that proposes reducing the height of the building and altering the roof form. The ridge height would be reduced by approximately 1.9m and the roof form is considered less dominant. On the rear elevation, which would have the most impact on neighbours, the eaves height has been reduced by approximately 1.1m to 2.3m when measured from the application site.

Whilst it is noted that the land level of Orchard Close is lower than the application site, under permitted development, an outbuilding that is within 2m of a boundary can have a maximum height of 2.5m (when measured from the application site). Therefore under Class E (e) (ii) of the General Permitted Development Order, the eaves height would be considered permitted development. Additionally, if the garage had a flat roof it could be considered permitted development and planning permission would not necessarily be required.

The ridge height ranges from approximately 3.6m on the front elevation to approximately 4.3m on the rear elevation. It should be noted that under Class E of the General Permitted Development Order, that if the garage was over 2m away from the boundary, that the height could be a maximum of 4m. Taking this into account, although the garage is within 2m of the boundary it is only 0.3m above what would be allowed under permitted development and therefore it is not considered reasonable to refuse the application on this basis.

It is proposed to remove the window within the existing north east elevation and to plant a hedge screen along the rear boundary of the site to reduce impact on neighbouring properties. In the event of an approval, a condition would be included that ensures the boundary treatment is maintained.

The revised scheme helps to overcome issues raised by neighbours in regards to the garage appearing overbearing and intrusive and in addition due to the reduction in height, the garage does not have the appearance of a two storey dwelling and would not create an unacceptable loss of light. The removal of the window on the rear elevation also removes the element of a loss of privacy.

In regards to the garages proximity to the boundary, at the narrowest point the building is approximately 0.8 meters from the boundary and at the widest point it is 1.3 metres to the boundary. It should be noted that if the garage was considered permitted development that it could abut the site boundary and a gap would not be required. Whilst it is appreciated that the garage is close to the boundary, it is considered that there is sufficient space for boundary treatment and informal opinion of the Council's Landscape and Ecology team is that a leylandii hedge is appropriate. In regards to maintenance of the boundary treatment, that would be a matter for the owner.

Comments have been received from Northaw and Cuffley Parish Council and it appears that they prefer the garage as it is currently built rather than the revised scheme. However the Council is still of the opinion that the revised scheme is more appropriate and acceptable.

Taking into account the reduced roof height and the planting of the leylandii hedge screen, it is considered that the amenity of adjoining occupiers is maintained to an acceptable level and does not warrant the refusal of the application.

Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): The proposal is for the retention of a detached double garage and therefore there are no issues in regards to parking.

Any other issues	
Conclusion	
<p>The development is of good quality design which reflects the character and context of the host dwelling, remains subordinate in scale and would retain the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers to an acceptable level. Accordingly, the development complies with Policies D1, D2, M14 and GBSP2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance Statement of Council Policy 2005, the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards 2004 and Interim Car Parking and Garage Policy 2014 as well as relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	

Conditions:

1. Within 3 months of the date of this permission the development/works shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans and details:

GVBS - 6B Hill Rise received and dated 14th March 2016

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details.

2. The brickwork, roof tile, bond, mortar, detailing, guttering, soffits and other external decorations of the approved extension/alterations must match the existing dwelling/building in relation to colour and texture.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

3. The hedge[s] marked on the attached plan numbered GVBS - 6B Hill Rise shall be retained unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to its removal or variation. Should any part of the hedge die, be removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, it shall be replaced during the following planting season by a hedge planted in accordance with a specification previously approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To protect the existing planting in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policy D8 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

1. REASON FOR APPROVAL

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 viewed on the Councils website or inspected at these offices).

Informatives:

Determined By:

Mr A Mangham
6 April 2016