

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR - PLANNING, PUBLIC PROTECTION AND GOVERNANCE**

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/0866/HOUSE
Location: 9 Fore Street Hatfield AL9 5AN
Proposal: Erection of pre-fabricated timber summerhouse
Officer: Ms L Hale

Recommendation: Granted

6/2017/0866/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The site is located on the southern side of Fore Street and consists of a mid-terrace property. The property is a grade II Listed Building.</p> <p>The application seeks planning permission for the erection of timber summerhouse in the rear garden. The summerhouse would measure approximately 3.1 metres deep by 3.9 metres wide with an eaves height of 2.1 and maximum height of 3.3 metres. It would be constructed of timber with a sheet lead roof.</p>
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>CA - Conservation Area: HATF; PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) Wards - Hatfield East</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Former Rectory for inferior clergy in Hatfield LBC - LISTED BUILDING Semi-detached pair of houses. Early C19. Yellow LBC - LISTED BUILDING House, (Formerly The Travellers' Rest PH). Later LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. C18 chequered red brick front to earlier LBC - LISTED BUILDING C17 timberframed barn. Weatherboarded. Steep LBC - LISTED BUILDING Large house of early C18. Now house and office. LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. C17 and earlier timber frame, 1 bay wide. LBC - LISTED BUILDING House (formerly a pair known as Nos 15 and 17). LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Mid-late C18. Painted brick. Slate LBC - LISTED BUILDING House, formerly butchers shop. Early C19. LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C17 painted brick front, probably to LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C18, but with earlier timberframed LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C18. Painted brick upper floors. LBC - LISTED BUILDING Former stable, immediately S of rear elevation. LBC - LISTED BUILDING Early-mid C18 (formerly known as Nos 3 and 3A).</p>

	<p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair, left one now part of public house.</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Formerly the Rose & Crown Inn. Prob C15. Timber</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House and shop. Prob C17 timber frame. Late C19</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Early C19 red brick front to earlier</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C18 or early C19 red brick front.</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair. Red brick front, prob Late C18. C17</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair. Circa 1800. Red brick. Plain tile</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Later C18. Chequered red brick on</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Mid C18. Chequered red brick on a</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Circa 1800. Red brick. Slate mansard roof</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Late C18 red brick house. Plain tile gable end</p>		
Relevant planning history	<p>S6/1984/0614/ - Single storey extension – Granted 14/12/1984</p> <p>S6/1984/0615/LB – Demolition of conservatory and erection single storey extension, alterations and skylight – Granted 21/01/1985</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Publicity	<p>Site Notice Display Date: 19 May 2017</p> <p>Site Notice Expiry Date: 9 June 2017</p> <p>Press Advert Display Date: 17 May 2017</p> <p>Press Advert Expiry Date: 31 May 2017</p>		
Summary of neighbour responses	N/A		
Consultees and responses	<p>Andrew Robley – Conservation and Listed Building Officer - The quality of the summerhouse is acceptable the basic location. Concern regarding maintenance of thee existing rear wall and its historic nature. A 1 metre gap would be preferable between the summerhouse and the wall.</p>		
Relevant Policies			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input type="checkbox"/> GBSP1 <input type="checkbox"/> GBSP2 <input type="checkbox"/> M14 Others			
Main Issues			
Is the development within a conservation area?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be conserved or enhanced?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
Comment (if applicable):			
<p>Section 16 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act states that the local planning authority shall have “special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”. The specific historic environment policies within the NPPF are contained within paragraphs 126-141. Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March, 2012) states, ‘In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to 			

viable uses consistent with their conservation;

- The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness'

Paragraph 132 of the Framework outlines that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation and the more important the asset the greater the weight it should be given. Paragraph 133 states that where proposed development will lead to substantial harm or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, Local Planning Authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm. Where the harm is considered less than substantial Paragraph 134 states that this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The NPPF therefore does allow for a degree of harm to a heritage asset in particular circumstances.

The key issue with this application is to conserve the heritage asset by retaining and enhancing its character and appearance and preserving its architectural and historic fabric and setting.

Policies D1 and D2 of the adopted Welwyn Hatfield District Plan (2005) are of relevance and seek to provide a good standard of design in all new development and require that all new development respects and relates to the character and context of the area in which it is to be sited.

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of timber summerhouse in the rear garden. The summerhouse would measure approximately 3.1 metres deep by 3.9 metres wide with an eaves height of 2.1 and maximum height of 3.3 metres. The proposed location is to the rear of the garden, approximately 1 metre away from the boundary wall.

The timber summerhouse would be designed of pre-fabricated nature, being constructed from posts and panels under a sheet lead roof. The design would include fine details such as fluted posts, putty line glazing bead and brass fittings. The proposed materials are not considered objectionable. The summerhouse would feature glazing on the front elevation and the side elevations.

As a result of the rear siting, the proposal would not be visible from the streetscene of Fore Street and is therefore not considered to result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal is in accordance with policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

Would the development reflect the character of the area?

Yes No

Comment (if applicable): See above

Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): See above

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

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable):

The proposed development would be sited at the rear of the residential garden and would be closest to the boundary with No.7 and No.11 Fore Street.

The proposed summerhouse is not considered to result in an overbearing impact to this neighbouring property nor would it detrimentally impact the amenity of any other nearby residents. It is noted that glazing is proposed within the shed, however, these are considered to be obscured by a high boundary wall restricting views towards any neighbouring dwellings and as such are not considered to result in overlooking that would justify a refusal of the application.

Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
Comment (if applicable):	
Any other issues	N/A
Conclusion	
The proposed development is not considered to result in harm to the character and appearance of the property or surrounding area and would not result in a detrimental impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan 2005.	

Conditions:

1. The materials to be used in the construction of the proposed summerhouse, shall be those as specified within the application form dated 25th April 2017.

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.

DRAWING NUMBERS

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

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
		Block Plan	13 June 2017
3899.E1A		Elevations	26 April 2017
3899.L1A		Roof Plan	26 April 2017
		Site Location Plan	26 April 2017

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

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
14 June 2017