

## WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL DIRECTORATE OF STRATEGY AND DEVELOPMENT

# **DELEGATED APPLICATION**

Application No:	6/2016/0463/HOUSE		
Location:	6 Hill Rise, Cuffley, Potters Bar, EN6 4EE		
Proposal:	Erection of single story rear extension		
Officer:	Mr A Mangham		

## Recommendation: Granted

# 6/2016/0463/HOUSE

Context				
Site and Application description	The site consists of a two storey detached property on the top quarter of Hill Rise. The area is residential in character featuring detached and semi detached properties. The applicant seeks permission for a single storey 'infill' rear extension. The extension, to form an extended living room, will not project beyond the line of the rear of the ex.dwelling. The extension will include bi-fold doors, with facing brick work to match the existing. The extension contains no side windows to the party boundary.			
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	The site lies within the specified settlement of Cuffley as designated in the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.			
Relevant planning history	Application Number: 6/2016/0038/HOUSE			
	Decision: Granted			
	Decision Date: 06 April 2016			
	Proposal: Retention of detached garage, and alterations to roof to reduce the height.			
	Application Number: S6/1978/0692/ Decision: Granted Decision Date: 05 January 1979			
	Proposal: Single storey side extension			
	Application Number: S6/1984/0759/ Decision: Granted Decision Date: 04 February 1985			
	Proposal: Ground and first floor extensions			
Consultations				

Publicity         Neighbour letter           Summary of neighbour responses         None           Town / Parish representations         Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council (States No objection)           Consultees and responses         Councillor George Michaelides councillor John Nicholls           Relevant Policies         Councillor George Michaelides councillor John Nicholls           Relevant Policies         NPPF           D1         D2         GBSP1           Bis the development within a conservation area?         Is           Yes No         Comment (if applicable):           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 (if applicable):           Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?           Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):           Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.           No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any si	Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0		
Summary of neighbour responses         None           Town / Parish representations         Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council (States No objection)           Consultees and responses         Councillor George Michaelides Councillor John Nicholls           Relevant Policies         NPPF           D2         GBSP1           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         Yes No           Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the area? Yes No           Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable):           Would the development mether the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)         Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable):           Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.           No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Duc to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side	representations					
Summary of neighbour responses         None           Town / Parish representations         Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council (States No objection)           Consultees and responses         Councillor George Michaelides Councillor John Nicholls           Relevant Policies         NPPF           D2         GBSP1           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         Yes No           Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the area? Yes No           Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable):           Would the development mether the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)         Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable):           Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.           No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Duc to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side	Dash li sita	Naishbaunlattas				
neighbour         responses         Town / Parish         representations         Concillor George Michaelides         councillor John Nicholls         Relevant Policies         NPPF         D1       D2         GBSP1       GBSP2         M4in 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 (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?         Yes No         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         No N/A         Comment		-				
representations Consultees and responses Councillor George Michaelides Councillor John Nicholls 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 (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the area? Yes No Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, Ight etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection form this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	neighbour	None				
responses         Councillor John Nicholls           Relevant Policies         NPPF           D         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):         Comment (if applicable):           Would the development reflect the character of the area?         Yes No         Yes No           Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?         Yes No           Yes         No         A         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?           Yes         No         N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)           Yes         No         N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.           No objections have been received from the neighbouring prop		Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council (States No objection)				
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 (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?           Yes         No         XA         Comment (if applicable):           Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?         Yes         No           Yes         No         N/A         Comment (if applicable):           Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)         Yes           Yes         No         N/A         Comment (if applicable):           Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.           No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill </th <th>Consultees and</th> <th>Councillor George Micha</th> <th>aelides</th> <th></th>	Consultees and	Councillor George Micha	aelides			
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 (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	responses	Councillor John Nicholls				
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 (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in						
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 (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siding of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	D1 D2 GBSP1 GBSP2 M14					
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 (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	Main Issues					
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 (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.         No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file.         In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant imp	Is the development within a conservation area?					
Yes No Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the area? Yes No Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	Yes No					
Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the area? Yes No Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the sitting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	Would the significa	nce of the designated h	eritage asset be conserve	d or enhanced?		
Yes No Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in		ble):				
Comment (if applicable): Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling? Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	Would the develop	ment reflect the charact	er of the area?			
Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.         No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file.         In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in						
Yes No N/A <b>Comment</b> (if applicable): <b>Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers?</b> (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A <b>Comment</b> (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	Comment (if applica	ıble):				
Comment (if applicable): Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.) Yes No N/A Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in		ment reflect the charact	er of the dwelling?			
light etc.)         Yes No N/A         Comment (if applicable):         Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings.         No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file.         In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in		ble):				
<b>Comment</b> (if applicable): Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	-	ment maintain the amer	ity of adjoining occupiers	? (e.g. privacy, outlook,		
Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as way that minimises overlooking between dwellings. No objections have been received from the neighbouring property to the development, at No. 8 Hill Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file.						
Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection from this residency has been put forward to the file. In light of these observations, the proposed extension would not result in any significant impacts on the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	Policy D1 in the Supplementary design guidance states that an extension should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of the length of projection and the height or the proximity of the extension. It should be designed, oriented and positioned in such as					
the residential amenity of the neighbouring property. The proposal is considered to be acceptable in	Rise respectively. Due to the siting of the side extension and the absence of any side windows, it is not considered to have an impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 8 Hill Rise in terms of loss of light, overlooking or appearing overly dominant. It is noted that no objection					
Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?	Would the develop					

Yes No N/A

**Comment** (if applicable):

#### Any other issues

### Conclusion

The proposed development would respect the character of the area, reflect the design of the host dwelling and maintain the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining occupiers. Accordingly, the development complies with policies D1, D2 and GBSP2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance Statement of Council Policy 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

# **Conditions:**

1. The development/works shall not be started and completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details:

DPL.01 & DPL.02 & DPL.03 & DPL.04 & DPL.05 & DPL.06 & DPL.07 & DPL.08 & DPL.09 received and dated 30 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.

1. POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

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).

## **Determined By:**

Mrs L Hughes 25 May 2016