

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2016/0476/HOUSE  
**Location:** The Barn, 5 Lysley Place, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, AL9 6NZ  
**Proposal:** Erection of first floor rear extension  
**Officer:** Mr M Peacock

**Recommendation:** Granted

6/2016/0476/HOUSE

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Application description</b>	Erection of first floor rear extension.
<b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b>	GB - Greenbelt LCA - Landscape Character Area (North Mymms Common and Newgate Street Farmed Plateau) PAR - PARISH (NORTH MYMMS) WARD - BROOKMANS PARK AND LITTLE HEATH
<b>Relevant planning history</b>	S6/2015/1433/HOUSE – Erection of first floor extension (Granted 12/11/2015)  S6/2015/1432/HOUSE – Internal and external alterations to create guest accommodation, gym/games room and library (Granted 12/11/2015)  S6/2012/0395/FP – Proposed external alterations to create guest accommodation gym/games room and library (Granted 30/04/2012)  S6/2012/0396/FP – Erection of first floor extension (Granted 14/06/2012)  S6/2002/0343/FP – Erection of front and rear porches (Granted 07/05/2002)  S6/2001/1203/FP – Retention of tennis court, ornamental pond bridge, gazebo, garden shed, rose arches and pergolas and installation of wrought iron field and entrance gates (Granted 10/12/2001)  S6/2001/0058/FP – Single storey building over pool (Refused 14/05/2001 subsequently allowed on appeal)  S6/2000/1589/FP – Erection of part first floor extension, and new dormer windows (Granted 12/03/2001)  S6/2000/1588/FP – Swimming pool (Granted 12/03/2001)
<b>Consultations</b>	

<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	Site Notice Display Date: 20 April 2016 Site Notice Expiry Date: 11 May 2016		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	None		
<b>Town / Parish representations</b>	<i>"NMPC would like to comment that this site which is in Green Belt has been extended excessively in the past, therefore, there should be no more permitted development to the property."</i>		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	None		
<b>Relevant Policies</b>			
NPPF D1 D2 GBSP1 GBSP2 M14 Others: RA3 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt			
<b>Main Issues</b>			
<b>Is the development within a conservation area?</b>			
Yes No			
<b>Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be conserved or enhanced?</b>			
Yes No N/A			
<b>Comment (if applicable):</b>			
<b>Would the development reflect the character of the area?</b>			
Yes No			
<b>Comment (if applicable):</b> The proposal is to extend an existing gable projection to the rear of the dwelling over an existing single storey area.  The proposed extension would reflect the appearance of the existing rear gable projections and would be subordinate in scale when considered with the main dwelling. The proposal would not appear overly prominent and would reflect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the locality. In this respect, no objections are raised with regard to Policies D1 and D2 of Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the SDG and the Framework.			
<b>Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?</b>			
Yes No N/A			
<b>Comment (if applicable):</b>			
<b>Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)</b>			
Yes No N/A			
<b>Comment (if applicable):</b> No objections to the proposed development were received from neighbouring occupiers or the Parish Council on amenity grounds. Giving consideration to the scale of the proposal, orientation and its setting, it is considered that the extension would not have an unreasonable impact on light amenity or the level of privacy afforded to the neighbouring residencies and would not appear visually overbearing. The amenity of the adjoining occupiers would be maintained to an acceptable level in accordance with Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the SDG and the NPPF.			
<b>Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?</b>			

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable):

Any other issues

**Whether the proposal is inappropriate development within the Green Belt and the effect of the proposal on the openness, character and appearance of the Green Belt**

The application dwelling has previously been extended and the previous additions have to be cumulatively considered in terms of their impact upon the openness of the Green Belt and compliance with Green Belt Policy. Planning Application S6/2001/0058/FP was refused planning consent on the ground that the extensions would have an adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt, but the development was allowed on appeal. The Inspector's decision letter considered the existing extensions and made an assessment of the floorspace increase. Within this appeal the additions to the property resulted in approximately a 50% increase from the original floorspace of the dwelling. This increase is less than that of neighbouring properties and although the application dwelling is the largest property within the Lysley Place complex, the Inspector found that this increase should not be considered to be disproportionate.

Since this appeal decision the application dwelling has carried out works within the grounds that were granted retrospective planning permission within application S6/2001/1203/FP. Additional extensions were also added to the main dwelling following planning permission S6/2002/0343/FP. Both of these applications comprised relatively minor additions and have not cumulatively significantly added to the bulk and massing of the dwelling. Therefore, although these additions must be considered, the comments within the Inspector's decision letter are still relevant.

The application dwelling features two rear facing gable projections. An extension to one of these was granted in November 2015 under planning permission S6/2015/1433/HOUSE. The current proposal would bring the second gable in line with extension approved in last year, which has yet to be constructed. The proposal would result in approximately 11.6m<sup>2</sup> of additional floorspace and be identical. As the proposal is within the roofspace, the useable floorspace does not cover the whole area of the first floor and the floorspace does not directly relate to the bulk and massing of the dwelling. In this case the floorspace increase is not particularly significant and the visual impact of the proposed development is more important in assessing the proposal's impact upon the Green Belt.

When considering the proposal's size it would not be a significant addition to the existing property. Due to the siting of the proposal being an addition to the roof, it would add to the bulk and massing of the dwelling. The additional bulk would not be excessive and the additional size of the gable would not appear significantly more dominant than the existing dwelling. Due to the proposal having a pitched roof its bulk diminishes with height and the overall appearance would not be too dominant or overbearing. Being sited to the rear of the property the proposal would not be viewed from many areas outside of the application site and its size would be offset by the distance that separates the neighbouring land and development would generally be viewed against the backdrop of the existing dwelling.

It should be noted that the application dwelling has had several additions since the original property was approved and built. The cumulative impact of these extensions means that the application dwelling is either at or very close to the upper limit of what can be considered to not be disproportionate in size when compared to the original property. Therefore, any future application would have to be considered very carefully and are not likely to be acceptable if they add to the bulk and massing of the property. However, when considering the development allowed within the appeal of application S6/2001/0058/FP and the modest size of the other extensions to the dwelling, the proposed development is not considered disproportionate and, as such, would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

The extension would inevitably have some effect on the openness of the Green Belt. However, it is concluded that it would not be a disproportionate addition to the original building. Accordingly, the effect on openness would be limited and would not cause material harm to the Green Belt. The extension would not be contrary to any of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Therefore the proposal is consistent with Policy RA3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the Framework.

### **Conclusion**

Subject to the suggested planning conditions, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

### **Conditions:**

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

12114-P001 & 12114-S001 received and dated 23 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 Council's website or inspected at these offices).

### **Determined By:**

Mr A Mangham  
26 July 2016