

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2018/0020/HOUSE
Location: 16 Daffodil Close Hatfield AL10 9FF
Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension and conversion of garage into a habitable room
Officer: Mr Richard Sakyi

Recommendation: Refused

6/2018/0020/HOUSE

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The application property is a two-storey detached property with integral garage situated on the south side of Daffodil Close, which is a cul-de-sac. It is a modern property probably constructed in the early 2000 with red brick and interlocking concrete roof tiles. A 2 m high close boarded timber fence encloses the property with the adjoining properties. The existing rear wall is flush with the neighbouring properties at number 14 and 18 Daffodil Close. Number 18 and 14 Daffodil Close have rear conservatories in place.</p> <p>The area is characterised by modern detached dwellings with open-plan frontages with regular building lines at the front and rear from number 14 to 20 Daffodil Close.</p> <p>Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two storey rear extension and conversion of garage into a habitable room.</p>		
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>AAS - Area of Archaeological Significance : - Distance: 3.27 GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 44.54 PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) - Distance: 0 Wards - Hatfield Villages - Distance: 0 A4HD - Article 4 HMO Direction - Distance: 0 HAT - Hatfield Aerodrome - Distance: 0</p>		
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/2002/0967/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 04 October 2002 Proposal: Erection of 46 dwellings (amendments to planning approval ref. S6/1999/971/FP)</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1999/0971/FP Decision: Approval Subject to s106 Decision Date: 30 June 2000 Proposal: Erection of 144 houses and 26 flats with associated access roads, garages, parking areas and public open spaces, cycleways and footways</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0

Publicity	Neighbour notification letters
Summary of neighbour responses	None
Consultees and responses	<p>Historic Environment Advisor – Commented as follows: In this instance I consider that the development is unlikely to have a significant impact on heritage assets of archaeological interest, and I have no comment to make upon the proposal.</p> <p>Hertfordshire Transport Programmes & Strategy – commented as follows: The Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the imposition of recommended informatives in respect of storage of materials, obstruction of the highway and mud onto the highway.</p> <p>Joint Committee of the National Amenity Societies – No representation received</p>
Relevant Policies	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input type="checkbox"/> GBSP1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GBSP2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> M14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Design Guidance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Parking Guidance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interim Policy for car parking and garage sizes Others <u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016</u> SP4 Transport and Travel SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SP11 Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets SADM2 Highway Network and Safety SADM11 Amenity and Layout SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse	
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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No N/A	
Comment (if applicable):	
Would the development reflect the character of the area?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
<p>Comment (if applicable): The conversion of the integral garage to habitable accommodation would involve the removal of the garage doors and the bricking up the space and the installation of window and materials, which would reflect those of the existing house.</p> <p>The proposed two-storey rear extension would have a depth of 2.5m and although would project beyond the established rear building line of the property and the adjoining houses however it is not considered that this would have any adverse impact on the character of the building and the area by virtue of its size and scale. Furthermore, the proposed rear extension would be constructed with matching external materials to reflect those of the existing and the adjoining properties. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not have any significant adverse impact on the character of the area.</p>	

Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable):

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

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): The proposed conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation is considered acceptable and would not have any impact on the neighbouring properties by virtue of its location, size and use. The proposed two-storey rear extension would project beyond the rear walls of the adjoining properties however by reason of its orientation, size and siting, there would be no significant adverse impact on the present level of amenity enjoyed by these occupants to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

Number 18 and 14 Daffodil Close both have rear conservatories in place however it is not considered that the proposed rear extension would have any adverse impact in terms of loss of light, overbearing of or loss of outlook to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Saved Policy M14 of the District Plan and the Parking Standards SPG use maximum standards and are not consistent with the NPPF and are therefore afforded less weight. In August 2014 the Cabinet Housing and Planning Panel approved the Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards and Garage Sizes document. This document identifies the car parking standards set out in the SPG Parking Standards as guidelines rather than maximums and states that parking provision will be assessed on a case by case basis.

The Council's Car Parking Standards SPG recommends identifies the application site as being within zone 4 where residential dwellings with four or more bedrooms typically require three car parking spaces. Although it is accepted that the site is accessible to some facilities, it does not form one of the most accessible parts of the Borough and is not comparable to the town centres. The application site is located outside of a convenient walking distance from the nearest train station.

The dwellinghouse, as originally designed, has a provision of three car parking spaces - one single space within the garage and two parking spaces on the hardstanding in front of the garage which is an integral part of the design of this development. The proposed development would reduce the amount of parking spaces by one, retaining only two spaces for the four bedroom dwelling.

The loss of the use of the garage would not be compensated for by the provision of additional parking space within the site. This is because, the existing grassed area at the front appears to be inadequate by virtue of its limited width and therefore the imposition of a planning condition requiring the creation of additional space would be unreasonable and would not meet the test specified in the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is considered that the potential for a displaced vehicle being parked on-street would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the surrounding residential development. In making this assessment consideration has been given to the width of the carriageway, the availability of on-street parking and the density of the surrounding development.

The area is characterised by off-street parking provision in the form of garages and driveways of the dwellings. Where on-street parking is witnessed within the locality, it can often result in the problem of vehicles parking on the footpath which causes an obstruction and seriously inconvenience pedestrians. The loss of a parking space would add to the parking pressures within the vicinity and

consequently would exacerbate the existing problems of inconvenience to pedestrians. Furthermore, if planning permission were to be granted it would be difficult to resist similar applications from neighbouring properties. Although each proposal must be considered on its own merits, repetition of this type of development would result in a cumulative impact which would be likely to further increase the stress on parking provision within the locality resulting in a deleterious effect on the character of the area. The formal layout of the surrounding residential development would become cluttered and its overall appearance would be materially harmed by an increase in the presence of vehicles parked on-street. This adverse harm would be contrary to the saved Policies D1 and D2 concerning high quality design and character and context. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's core principle of securing high quality design.

Conclusion

By virtue of the relatively narrow width of the carriageway and based upon the observations of the on-street parking within the locality, the additional pressure for on-street parking would have a harmful effect on the character of the surrounding area. Although the design of the proposed extension would respect the appearance of the property, this would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the adverse harm to the locality as identified above. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would conflict with saved Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and therefore it is recommended that planning permission be refused.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal by virtue of the loss of the existing garage parking space would result in the loss of one off street parking space for the dwelling resulting in a deficit of parking for this dwelling. The proposal would increase the pressure for on road parking and would not be compatible with the maintenance and enhancement of the character of this residential development and accordingly fail to provide a high standard of design. Furthermore, the applicant has failed to demonstrate sufficient justification to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that would outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and saved Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan, the Supplementary Planning Guidance for Parking Standards 2004 and the Council's Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
1775-01	D	Double Storey Rear extension	3 January 2018

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 Mark Peacock
14 March 2018