

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2017/1000/HOUSE  
**Location:** Pulham House, Bedwell Park, Cucumber Lane, Essendon, Hatfield, AL9 6GJ  
**Proposal:** Formation of basement and erection of a single storey rear extension to enclose existing rear covered walkway.  
**Officer:** Mr D Elmore

**Recommendation:** Granted

6/2017/1000/HOUSE

<b>Context</b>			
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>The application site comprised a large detached dwelling set within generous grounds. This dwelling and its gardens forms part of the Bedwell Park re-development, granted planning permission under ref: S6/2006/0365/FP &amp; S6/2006/0425/LB.</p> <p>Planning permission is sought for the formation of a basement and erection of a single storey rear extension.</p>		
<b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b>	<p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Rambling country house of several periods, - Distance: 21.71</p> <p>GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0</p> <p>LCA - Landscape Character Area (West End - Brickendon Wooded Slopes) - Distance: 0</p> <p>PAR - PARISH (ESSENDON) - Distance: 0</p> <p>Wards - Brookmans Park &amp; Little Heath - Distance: 0</p> <p>HEN - No known habitats present (high priority for habitat creation) - Distance: 0</p> <p>TPO - TPO3 W6 - Distance: 0</p>		
<b>Relevant planning history</b>	<p>Application Number: S6/2011/1868/FP Date: 23 December 2011</p> <p>Proposal: Retention of shed</p>	Decision: Granted	Decision
	<p>Application Number: S6/2009/2401/MA Date: 02 February 2010</p> <p>Proposal: ERECTION OF KENNEL</p>	Decision: Refused	Decision
	<p>Application Number: S6/2009/2400/MA Date: 28 January 2010</p> <p>Proposal: ERECTION OF SHED</p>	Decision: Granted	Decision

	<p>Application Number: S6/2009/0697/MA      Decision: Refused      Decision Date: 10 August 2009          Proposal: RETENTION OF SHED AND KENNELS</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2008/1135/MA      Decision: Granted      Decision Date: 03 September 2008          Proposal: ERECTION OF TENNIS COURT CHANGING PAVILION</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2006/0425/LB      Decision: Approval Subject to s106          Decision Date: 16 February 2007          Proposal: Conversion of Listed Building into 17 apartments and demolition of modern 1980's extensions; 14 new build dwellings and 28 garage courtyard blocks, together with 40 parking spaces across the site, incorporating new build tennis court house and integral garage, proposed walled garden dwelling and garaging; conversion and extensions to eastern and western walled garden buildings to form swimming pool and storage/greenhouse building, plus associated landscaping</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2006/0365/FP      Decision: Approval Subject to s106          Decision Date: 16 February 2007          Proposal: Conversion of Listed Building into 17 apartments and demolition of modern 1980's extensions; 14 new build dwellings and 28 garage courtyard blocks, together with 40 parking spaces across the site, incorporating new build tennis court house and integral garage, proposed walled garden dwelling and garaging; conversion and extensions to eastern and western walled garden buildings to form swimming pool and storage/greenhouse building, plus associated landscaping</p>		
<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	Neighbour letters sent		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	No responses		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	Councillor Stephen Boulton – No response Councillor John Dean - No response Councillor Jonathan Boulton – No response Essendon Parish Council – No response WHBC (Landscaping Department) – No comment WHBC (Listed Building and Conservation Officer) – No response		
<b>Relevant Policies</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF			

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GBSP1 <input type="checkbox"/> GBSP2 <input type="checkbox"/> M14 Others: RA3	
<b>Main Issues</b>	
<b>Is the development within a conservation area?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be conserved or enhanced?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <b>Comment:</b> Although the application site is located within close proximity Bedwell Hall (Grade II Listed), the nature and scale of the proposed development would have a neutral impact upon the significance of this heritage asset.	
<b>Would the development reflect the character of the area?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <b>Comment:</b> Subject to external materials matching the subject property. This can be secured through planning condition.	
<b>Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<b>Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
<b>Principle of development within the Green Belt and effect on openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt</b>	<p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <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 Local 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>Following a review of planning history, it is understood that the subject property has not been extended or enlarged. As such, the existing property is taken to be the original building.</p> <p>The original building has a footprint of approximately 276.sqm. The proposed rear extension and basement extension would increase the footprint by 171.sqm. This represents a 62% increase in footprint beyond existing, and in terms of a quantitative assessment, would be regarded as disproportionate</p> <p>In terms of a qualitative assessment of the proposal in the context of the size and character of the dwelling and its surroundings, the proposed rear extension would essentially infill the existing rear covered walkway and would sit comfortably alongside the original dwelling. The proposed basement extension, by its nature, would be subterranean. An open air light well and</p>

	<p>2no circular roof lights would afford natural light into the basement. Such above ground additions would not detract from the design and character of the dwelling nor its setting within the Green Belt.</p> <p><i>Openness and visual amenity</i></p> <p>Any above ground development would to some extent diminish the openness of the Green Belt; however taking account of the massing of the proposal, siting and relationship with the host building it is considered that the proposal would not have a harmful effect upon the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>In terms of visual amenity, it is considered that the size, bulk or design of the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the character, appearance and pattern of development of the surrounding area.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i></p> <p>Although the proposed development would represent a significant increase in the footprint of the original dwelling, all above ground additions are not substantial and would maintain the design and character of the dwelling and its surroundings. Furthermore, the above ground aspects of the proposal would have no harmful effect upon the openness of the Green Belt and the visually amenity of the Green Belt would not be adversely affected. As such, it is considered, on balance, that the proposed development would represent proportionate additions and therefore an appropriate type of development.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p>Subject to the suggested planning condition, the proposed development complies with relevant local and national Green Belt policies.</p>	

**Conditions:**

1. 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.

**DRAWING NUMBERS**

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

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
1606/03		Proposed Elevations & Ground Floor Plan	9 May 2017
1606/04		Proposed Basement Plan & Sections	9 May 2017
1606/02		Existing Elevations & Plans	9 May 2017
1606/01		Location Plan	9 May 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).

**Informatives:**

1. This permission does not convey any consent which may be required under any legislation other than the Town and Country Planning Acts. Any permission required under the Building Regulations or under any other Act, must be obtained from the relevant authority or body e.g. Fire Officer, Health and Safety Executive, Environment Agency (Water interest etc. Neither does this permission negate or override any private covenants which may affect the land.

**Determined By:**

Mr A Mangham  
4 July 2017