

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/2063/LB
Location: 11 Fore Street Hatfield AL9 5AN
Proposal: Enlargement of current rear window, installation of rear bi-fold doors and replacement doors and windows to right hand side elevation
Officer: Ms L Sahlke

Recommendation: Refused

6/2017/2063/LB

| Context | |
|--|--|
| Site and Application description | <p>11 Fore Street is located within a historic area of Hatfield. The application site is located within Hatfield Conservation Area, an archaeological area of significance and is located adjacent and opposite Listed Buildings. The application site is also located within the Article 4 HMO Direction.</p> <p>11 Fore Street is Grade II Listed and was a former butchers shop converted in 1970 to a dwelling. The property was constructed in the early 19 Century. The dwelling is listed due to its group value.</p> |
| Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005) | <p>CA - Conservation Area: HATF; - Distance: 0</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Former Rectory for inferior clergy in Hatfield - Distance: 36.51</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Semi-detached pair of houses. Early C19. Yellow - Distance: 44.07</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House, (Formerly The Travellers' Rest PH). Later - Distance: 31.66</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. C18 chequered red brick front to earlier - Distance: 18.6</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING C17 timberframed barn. Weatherboarded. Steep - Distance: 0</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Large house of early C18. Now house and office. - Distance: 17.4</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. C17 and earlier timber frame, 1 bay wide. - Distance: 9.84</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House (formerly a pair known as Nos 15 and 17). - Distance: 5.85</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Mid-late C18. Painted brick. Slate - Distance: 0</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House, formerly butchers shop. Early C19. -</p> |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------|----------|
| | <p>Distance: 0</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C17 painted brick front, probably to - Distance: 0</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C18, but with earlier timberframed - Distance: 6.14</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C18. Painted brick upper floors. - Distance: 15.67</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Former stable, immediately S of rear elevation. - Distance: 20.02</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Early-mid C18 (formerly known as Nos 3 and 3A). - Distance: 20.2</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Also included 15/196. - Distance: 43.95</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair, left one now part of public house. - Distance: 35.17</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING Formerly the Rose & Crown Inn. Prob C15. Timber - Distance: 25.58</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House and shop. Prob C17 timber frame. Late C19 - Distance: 17.26</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Early C19 red brick front to earlier - Distance: 9.85</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Late C18 or early C19 red brick front. - Distance: 8.57</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair. Red brick front, prob Late C18. C17 - Distance: 10.06</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House pair. Circa 1800. Red brick. Plain tile - Distance: 17.47</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Later C18. Chequered red brick on - Distance: 26.06</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Mid C18. Chequered red brick on a - Distance: 33.44</p> <p>LBC - LISTED BUILDING House. Circa 1800. Red brick. Slate mansard roof - Distance: 43.2</p> <p>AAS - Area of Archaeological Significance : - Distance: 0</p> <p>PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) - Distance: 0</p> <p>Wards - Hatfield East - Distance: 0</p> <p>A4D - Article 4 HMO Direction - Distance: 0</p> <p>HEN - No known habitats present (high priority for habitat creation) - Distance: 0</p> <p>SAGB - Sand and Gravel Belt - Distance: 0</p> | | |
| Relevant planning history | No specific planning history. | | |
| Consultations | | | |
| Neighbour | Support: 0 | Object: 0 | Other: 0 |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| representations | | | |
| Publicity | Site Notice Display Date: 19 October 2017 Site Notice Expiry Date: 9 November 2017 Press Advert Display Date: 4 October 2017 Press Advert Expiry Date: 18 October 2017 | | |
| Summary of neighbour responses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None | | |
| Consultees and responses | Hertfordshire County Council - Historic Environment Advisor The development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest, and have no comment to make upon the proposal. Hatfield Town Council - No comments received. Conservation Officer – The application is for the enlargement of the current rear window, the installation of rear bi-fold doors and the replacement of doors and windows to the right hand side elevation at 11 Fore Street, Hatfield. 11 Fore Street is a grade II listed, three storey brick building dating from the early nineteenth century, which was formerly a butchers shop. The building forms part of a row of listed properties located on the south west side of Fore Street. The building is also located within Hatfield Conservation Area. The proposed alterations to the rear elevation of the listed building comprise the removal of the existing arched window and French doors to the ground floor level and their replacement with timber bi-fold doors. It is considered that this alteration would erode the legibility and balance of the fenestration pattern to the rear elevation, which would dilute the buildings architectural interest. In addition, the proposed bi-fold doors would not be in keeping with the character of the listed building. It is therefore considered that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the listed building. It is also proposed to replace the existing window to the second floor of the rear elevation and the existing windows and door to the west elevation of the rear projection with timber double glazed windows. There is no objection in principle to the replacement of the existing windows and door, however, it is considered that the design and detailing of the proposed windows would considerably alter the appearance of these elevations due to the change to the glazing bars, and therefore should be reconsidered to be in keeping with the character of the listed building. In conclusion, believe that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the listed building and would therefore not be able to support the application from a conservation perspective. | | |
| Relevant Policies | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF Others <u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission 2016</u> SADM 15 - Heritage | | | |
| Main Issues | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Impact on the character and setting of the listed building and adjoining listed buildings</p> | <p><u>Policy background</u></p> <p>Section 16 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act states that the local planning authority shall have “<i>special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses</i>”. 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, ‘<i>In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;</i> • <i>The positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and</i> • <i>The desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness’</i> <p>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.</p> <p>Policy SADM15 of the Draft Local Plan Submission 2016 is similar in these aims.</p> <p><u>Assessment</u></p> <p>Pre-application advice has not been undertaken. A heritage statement was requested by the validation team, however no additional information was provided instead the title of the original design and access statement was amended.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to install ground floor bi-folding doors. The bi-folding doors would replace the existing doors and window. The bi-folding doors would measure 2.25 metres in width and incorporate three panels of glass.</p> <p>The proposal also seeks to replace windows on the rear elevation and rear flank elevation. The glazing bars within the windows are more solid in width.</p> <p>The rear windows and doors would be replaced with new softwood painted timber units with double glazed units.</p> <p>The proposed alterations to the rear elevation of the listed building comprise the removal of the existing arched window and French doors to the ground floor level and their replacement with timber bi-fold doors. It is considered that this alteration would erode the legibility and balance of the fenestration pattern to the rear elevation, which would dilute the buildings architectural interest. In addition, the proposed bi-fold doors would not be in keeping with the character</p> |
|---|--|

of the listed building. It is therefore considered that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the listed building.

It is also proposed to replace the existing window to the second floor of the rear elevation and the existing windows and door to the west elevation of the rear projection with timber double glazed windows. There is no objection in principle to the replacement of the existing windows and door, however, it is considered that the design and detailing of the proposed windows would considerably alter the appearance of these elevations due to the change to the glazing bars.

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the listed building and would not be supported from a conservation perspective.

Finally, it is important to note that paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”

Although the installation of the double glazed windows and doors may improve the internal environment or the efficiency of the house, this is not considered to be a justification for the loss of an important heritage asset of this grade II listed building. The windows and doors are a significant element of the listed building. The proposed windows and doors are seen to have a detrimental impact on the character of the listed building due to their character and appearance. As the proposal is considered to lead to substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset, Listed Building Consent should be refused.

Conclusion

The proposed development would materially harm the special character of the Listed Building. The removal of the existing arched window and French doors to the ground floor level and their replacement with timber bi-fold doors would erode the legibility and balance of the fenestration pattern to the rear elevation, which would dilute the buildings architectural interest. In addition, the proposed bi-fold doors would not in keeping with the character of the listed building.

Furthermore, the design and detailing of the proposed replacement windows would considerably alter the appearance of the relevant elevations due to the change to the glazing bars, and therefore are considered out of keeping with the character of the listed building.

It is therefore considered that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the listed building.

It is not considered that sufficient information has been provided in regards to any public benefits from this proposal which would outweigh the harm of the proposed development on the character and significance of this designated heritage asset.

The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and Policy SADM 15 of the Draft Local Plan Proposed

| | |
|---|------------------|
| | Submission 2016. |
| Conclusion | |
| <p>The proposed development would materially harm the special character of the Listed Building. The removal of the existing arched window and French doors to the ground floor level and their replacement with timber bi-fold doors would erode the legibility and balance of the fenestration pattern to the rear elevation, which would dilute the buildings architectural interest. In addition, the proposed bi-fold doors would not in keeping with the character of the listed building.</p> <p>Furthermore, the design and detailing of the proposed replacement windows would considerably alter the appearance of the relevant elevations due to the change to the glazing bars, and therefore are considered out of keeping with the character of the listed building.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the listed building.</p> <p>It is not considered that sufficient information has been provided in regards to any public benefits from this proposal which would outweigh the harm of the proposed development on the character and significance of this designated heritage asset.</p> <p>The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and Policy SADM 15 of the Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission 2016.</p> | |

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would materially harm the special character of the Listed Building. The removal of the existing arched window and French doors to the ground floor level and their replacement with timber bi-fold doors would erode the legibility and balance of the fenestration pattern to the rear elevation, which would dilute the buildings architectural interest. In addition, the proposed bi-fold doors would not in keeping with the character of the listed building.

Furthermore, the design and detailing of the proposed replacement windows would considerably alter the appearance of the relevant elevations due to the change to the glazing bars, and therefore are considered out of keeping with the character of the listed building.

It is therefore considered that the proposed works would cause harm to the significance of the listed building.

It is not considered that sufficient information has been provided in regards to any public benefits from this proposal which would outweigh the harm of the proposed development on the character and significance of this designated heritage asset.

The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, and Policy SADM 15 of the Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission 2016.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

| Plan Number | Revision Number | Details | Received Date |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 17/1659/01 | A | Existing & Proposed Plan & Elevations | 14 September 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).

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 C Carter
9 November 2017