

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/0905/HOUSE
Location: 2 Waterworks Cottages, Northaw Road East, Cuffley, Potters Bar, EN6 4RB
Proposal: Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension, front porch, clipped gable hip roof enlargement, 3x front dormers, 1x rear dormer, 1x side roof light and alterations to openings.
Officer: Mr D Elmore

Recommendation: Refused

6/2017/0905/HOUSE

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The application property is a semi-detached, four bedroom house, in a pair with No. 1 Waterworks Cottages. The pair of houses were originally built for employees of the Water Authority as part of the adjoining Waterworks complex.</p> <p>The site is situated approximately 400 metres to the north-west of Northaw Road East and accessed via a private road which runs parallel to the Hempshill Brook river. It is located within the Green Belt and Northaw Common Parkland Landscape Character Area.</p> <p>Planning permission is sought for the following: <i>'Erection of single storey front, side and rear extension, front porch, clipped gable hip roof enlargement, 3x front dormers, 1x rear dormer, 1x side roof light and alterations to openings.'</i></p>		
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0 LCA - Landscape Character Area (Northaw Common Parkland) - Distance: 0 PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 0 ROW - FOOTPATH (NORTHAW 009) - Distance: 9.81 Wards - Northaw & Cuffley - Distance: 0 MR - Main River - Distance: 4.15</p>		
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/1990/0620/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 28 September 1990</p> <p>Proposal: Two storey side extension; single storey rear extension</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1990/0326/FP Decision: Refused Decision Date: 08 June 1990</p> <p>Proposal: Two storey side extension & single storey rear extension</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0

representations			
Publicity	Neighbour letters sent		
Summary of neighbour responses	None		
Consultees and responses	Councillor Bernard Sarson – No response Councillor George Michaelides – No response Councillor Irene Dean – No response Northaw and Cuffley Parish Council – No objection Environment Agency – No response		
Relevant Policies			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GBSP1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GBSP2 <input type="checkbox"/> M14 Others: Supplementary Design Guidance, RA3			
Main Issues			
Principle of development within the Green Belt	<p>The National Policy Framework (NPPF) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The construction of new buildings is to be regarded as inappropriate, apart from various exceptions. One of these exceptions is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This is in line with Policy RA3 'Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt'. Policy RA3 also outlines further criteria in this regard in that extensions to existing dwellings would also only be allowed where the development would not have an adverse visual impact (in terms of its prominence, size, bulk and design) on the character, appearance and pattern of development of the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>The NPPF and the Council's District Plan provides no guidance for establishing whether a proposal would be disproportionate; however the assessment of "proportionality" has been developed through planning decisions to take into consideration both a quantitative and qualitative methodology.</p> <p>In terms of a quantitative assessment, an analysis of footprint and floor space is normally a good proxy for the overall size of extensions.</p> <p>The original property had a footprint of 50.sqm and floor space of 91.sqm. A two storey side extension and single storey rear extension has been constructed under planning permission: S6/1990/0620/FP. As a result of these extensions, the property now has a footprint of 97.sqm and floor space of 160.sqm</p> <p>The extensions proposed under this application would result in a property which would have a footprint of 144.sqm and floor space of 241.sqm. The proposed extensions, taken together with previous extensions, would represent a 186% increase in the footprint and 165% in the floor space over the original property. These percentage are substantial and based independently on the above calculations, the proposed extensions would be regarded as disproportionate.</p> <p>In terms of a qualitative assessment, the scale and location of the proposed extension and additional scale and bulk created in the roof, would have a clear</p>		

	<p>visual impact upon the size and character of the dwelling in its Green Belt setting.</p> <p>Taking account of the above, the proposed development would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.</p> <p>The NPPF confirms that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Whilst there is a visual element to loss of openness in the sense that a loss of openness is perceived by the human eye, openness is essentially an absence of built development in the Green Belt and that is one of the essential characteristics which national policy seeks to protect. It seeks to keep land free from built development and the curtilages of dwellings have a role to play in keeping land open.</p> <p>The existing dwelling is set in approximately 5.4 metres from the side boundary which abuts the former site of Waterworks Complex which now features no above ground development. Although only limited views of the site are afforded from the public right of way running parallel with Hempshill Brook river, it is however adjacent to open countryside. The proposed side extension would measure 4.3 metres in width, thereby reducing this gap to 1.1 metres. The reduction of this visual gap in the manner proposed would adversely affect the spacious setting, visual permeability and openness of the site and surrounding context. Furthermore, the proposed enlargements and alterations to the roof would add bulk and massing to the property which would further exacerbate the loss of openness and visual permeability of the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Whether there are any very special circumstances that clearly outweigh any harm to the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The NPPF advises that, when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The proposed side extension would be used as an annexe for the father of the applicant and homeowner of the subject property. A letter from the Doctor of the applicants' father has been submitted alongside this application and explains that the applicants' father is in need of constant care as a result of health and wellbeing factors and permitting the proposed extension would allow the applicant to look after his father and give his father a better quality of life in his latter years.</p> <p>It is however noted that the proposed development goes beyond a ground floor extension and includes enlargements and alterations to the roof of the dwelling for which no justification relative to the applicants fathers needs has been made. It has also already been considered that the ground floor extension, treated independently from the works to the roof, would have a material impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. Additionally, in light of the comparative quantitative measurements set out in this report, the footprint of the ground floor extension, it itself, would represent a disproportionate addition within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The very special circumstances of the applicants' father is afforded limited weight. This weight would not clearly outweigh the substantial harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness and impact upon openness.</p>
<p>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance</p>	<p>The proposed front, side and rear extension would feature a pitched roof (front and rear gables) and connect to the existing single storey rear extension in a 'wrap-around' effect. The roof connection of this proposed extension to the flank wall of the dwelling and with the mono-pitched roof the existing rear</p>

within the streetscene)	<p>extension would appear awkward and contrived. Furthermore, the use of a front gable ends would fail to complement and reflect the design and character of the existing dwelling.</p> <p>The existing dwelling features a hip-end roof. It is proposed to alter and enlarge this roof to form a clipped gable roof. The original pair of cottages featured hip-ends and No. 1 has altered its roof from hip to gable, including a rear dormer under what appears to be permitted development. The Council however have no record of a lawful development certificate for this property. Considering the gable ended roof of No. 1, the proposed clipped gable roof enlargement would adequately maintain the existing character of the semi-detached pair and is therefore considered acceptable, subject to roof tile matching that of the host property.</p> <p>Now turning to the proposed dormer windows. Section 5, 5.2(vi) of the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 (Statement of Council Policy 2005) states that "<i>dormer windows should be contained within the roof slope, be subservient to the roof of the property and be in proportion to the existing fenestrations of the property. They must not extend above the ridge height of the existing dwelling and the dormer cheeks should be at least 1 metre from the flank wall of the property or the party wall with the adjoining property.</i>"</p> <p>The proposed rear dormer would only be set in 0.4 metres from the flank wall with the adjoining property and therefore fails to meet the minimum 1 metre set in distance as stipulated above. Furthermore, this rear dormer, by virtue of its width and height, would dominate the resultant roof slope. Accordingly, this element of the proposal would represent a poor standard of design.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the unacceptability of the rear dormer, the proposed front dormers are modest in their scale, in proportion to the existing fenestrations of the property and their pitched roofs would complement the principal roof form.</p> <p>The proposed front porch would be subordinate in scale to the host dwelling and has a limited depth so as to ensure that it is not prominent.</p>
Impact on neighbours	The proposed development would be overly dominant or result in loss of light, as a result of length of projection, height or proximity to the shared boundary with No. 1 Waterworks Cottages.
Access, car parking and highway considerations	None
Landscaping Issues	None
Any other considerations	None
Conclusion	
<p>The proposed development results in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and therefore represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Furthermore, the increased bulk, footprint and massing of the proposed development would result in a loss of openness and visual permeability of the Green Belt. Very special circumstances do not exist. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy GBSP1, GBSP2 and RA3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p> <p>The roof design of the proposed front, side and rear extension would connect to the existing flank wall and single storey rear element in an awkward and contrived manner. Furthermore, the use of a pitched roof with front gable would fail to be in keeping with the design and character of the existing dwelling. As such, this element of the proposal would represent a poor standard of design which</p>	

would fail to complement and reflect the design and character of the existing dwelling, contrary to Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 (Statement of Council Policy) and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

The proposed rear dormer, by virtue of its width and height, would fail to be subservient to the roof of the property and, given its positioning on the roof slope, would fail to provide effective relief from the party wall with the adjoining property. Accordingly, this element of the proposal represents a poor standard of design, contrary to Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 (Statement of Council Policy) and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed development results in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and therefore represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Furthermore, the increased bulk, footprint and massing of the proposed development would result in a loss of openness and visual permeability of the Green Belt. Very special circumstances do not exist. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy GBSP1, GBSP2 and RA3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
2. The roof design of the proposed front, side and rear extension would connect to the existing flank wall and single storey rear element in an awkward and contrived manner. Furthermore, the use of a pitched roof with front gable would fail to be in keeping with the design and character of the existing dwelling. As such, this element of the proposal would represent a poor standard of design which would fail to complement and reflect the design and character of the existing dwelling, contrary to Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 (Statement of Council Policy 2005) and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.
3. The proposed rear dormer, by virtue of its width and height, would fail to be subservient to the roof of the property and, given its positioning on the roof slope, would fail to provide effective relief from the party wall with the adjoining property. Accordingly, this element of the proposal represents a poor standard of design, contrary to Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 (Statement of Council Policy 2005) and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

4.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
12537-S002	A	Existing Plans & Elevations	8 May 2017
12537-S001		Existing Plans & Elevations	2 May 2017
12537-P003	E	Proposed Plans & Elevations	8 May 2017

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
29 June 2017