

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/1476/HOUSE
Location: 31 Selwyn Crescent Hatfield AL10 9NL
Proposal: Erection of first floor front, side and rear extensions
Officer: Mrs K Charles

Recommendation: Refused

6/2017/1476/HOUSE

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>No.31 Selwyn Crescent is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of the crescent. The dwelling has been previously extended with a side extension and front porch.</p> <p>The proposal is for a first floor front and two storey side and rear extensions.</p>		
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>Listed Building – 44.14m Parish (HATFIELD) Wards - Hatfield Villages Article 4 HMO Direction No known habitats present (medium priority for habitat creation)</p>		
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/1988/0216/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 11 April 1988</p> <p>Proposal: Single storey side extension to form garage and front porch</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0
Publicity			
Summary of neighbour responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33 Selwyn Crescent, objects that: The development would result in an unreasonable loss of privacy 		
Consultees and responses	<p>WHBC - Conservation - Andrew Robley advise that the development would not harm the setting of the listed building</p>		
Relevant Policies			
<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> M14			

Others
Main Issues
Is the development within a conservation area?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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): The application site is located to the rear of The Comet Hotel which is a Grade II Listed Building. The Listed Building is approximately 44m away from No.31 Selwyn Crescent and both buildings are separated by the hotel car park and the residential garden and therefore the heritage of the listed building would be preserved.
Would the development reflect the character of the area?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Comment (if applicable): Policy D1 requires the standard of design in all new development to be of a high quality and Policy D2 requires all new development to respect and relate to the character and context of the area in which it is proposed. It notes that development proposals should as a minimum maintain, and where possible, should enhance or improve the character of the existing area. Policy GBSP2 requires that 'within specified settlements development will be limited to that which is compatible with the maintenance and enhancement of their character'. The Welwyn Hatfield District Plan Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG) supplements the policies contained in the District Plan. The application seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey rear and side extensions and a first floor extension. The proposed extensions would be located to the rear, side and front of the host dwelling, and would be visible within the streetscene. The size and design is considered to be an over prominent feature and at the rear the proposed width would be greater than the existing dwelling and fail to be subordinate to the existing dwelling. Accordingly, this proposal is considered to represent a poor standard of design. The SPG requires all multi-storey, two-storey and first floor side extensions, a minimum distance of 1m between the extension and the adjoining flank boundary must be maintained; it is important that existing spacing in the street scene is reflected which may result in larger distances being required. This spacing is to prevent over development across plot widths and a terracing effect within areas of detached and semi-detached properties, to ensure that the extension of a dwelling does not prejudice the ability of an adjacent occupier to extend without destroying any separation spaces that exist and to preserve the amenity of adjoining dwellings including those whose rear gardens adjoin the proposed extension'. The proposed first floor extension and two storey extension would have a separation distance of approximately 0.2m which would not be considered to be sufficient and would be contrary to policy. The proposed materials are to match the existing dwelling however, overall it is considered that the design would relate poorly to the host dwelling and it follows that there is conflict with Policies GBSP2, D1 and D2 of the adopted Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 insofar as these seek to ensure that development is designed to a high quality, respects local character and context and is compatible with the character of the locality. The proposal further conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of design.
Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A Comment (if applicable): As above
Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Comment (if applicable) Policies D1 and the Supplementary Design Guidance aim to preserve neighbouring amenity. Furthermore, guidance in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. With regard to the impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours, Policy D1 and the SDG states that any extension should not cause loss of light or appear unduly dominant from an adjoining property and should not result in undue overlooking of a neighbouring property or result in a loss of privacy.

The neighbour most likely to be affected by the proposal is No. 33 Selwyn Crescent. The proposed development would extend further back beyond the adjacent property. Although the development would be within closer proximity to the common boundary, the first floor element, would not be unduly dominant or result in loss of light to this adjacent property.

In terms of privacy, new first floor side windows serving a bedroom and family room would be installed. This window would present views toward the flank window of this adjacent property. As such, in the event of a grant of planning permission, it would be considered necessary and reasonable for this window to be glazed in obscure glass and have a restricted level of opening in order to maintain the levels of privacy enjoyed by the occupier(s) of No. 33 Parsonage Lane. This property is attached to the host dwelling. It is not considered that the proposed development being single storey would result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of this neighbouring occupier in terms of loss of light, appearing unduly dominant or result in an impact on privacy.

Overall, it is considered that the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers are maintained to an acceptable level in accordance Policy D1 Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and Supplementary Design Guidance 2005.

Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): The amount of bedrooms within the dwelling has increase by one. The site provides parking for approximately two spaces and although it is advised that within Zone 3, that a four bedroom dwelling should provide three spaces, it is considered that there would be sufficient on-street parking if required.

Any other issues

There are a number of trees along the boundary of No.31 and 33 Selwyn Crescent which could be harmed if development were to be approved. Although the trees do not have a high amenity value, one or more of the trees do not stand within the application site. There is no indication that the application has considered these trees through an Arboricultural Implication Report. It is also possible that a neighbouring tree will immediately physically encroach onto the proposed extension, this conflict does not appear to be considered.

Should the application be approved a condition should be placed on the approval for the applicant to submit a Tree Protection Statement for the tree(s) either on, adjacent or on the roadside. It should cover how the applicant will ensure the tree parts, both above or below ground, will not be directly or indirectly damaged. The scale of the document should reflect the importance of the trees in the landscape and the size of the building works. The statement should reflect BS5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations). For example, to avoid root damage by soil compaction, all site vehicles shall not park or drive on the verges. This Statement shall be submitted to the Council for approval before any works, including demolition, start on site

Conclusion

The proposed development, by virtue of its scale and proximity to the flank boundary, would result in overdevelopment across the plot width of site, fail to reflect the established spacing of dwellings adjacent to and in the immediate locality of the site and represent an incongruous addition relative to the character and design of dwellings in the street scene. Accordingly, this proposal represents a

poor standard of design contrary to Policy D1, D2 and GBSP2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance (Statement of Council Policy 2005) and relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale and proximity to the flank boundary, would result in overdevelopment across the plot width of site, fail to reflect the established spacing of dwellings adjacent to and in the immediate locality of the site and represent an incongruous addition relative to the character and design of dwellings in the street scene. Accordingly, this proposal represents a poor standard of design contrary to Policy D1, D2 and GBSP2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance (Statement of Council Policy 2005) and relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
00237508-1CC100		Location Plan	14 July 2017
		Site Plan	5 July 2017
A1-16-001		Existing Plans	13 July 2017
A1-16-002		Proposed Plans	12 July 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 C Carter
3 October 2017