

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2018/0225/HOUSE
Location: 31 Selwyn Crescent Hatfield AL10 9NL
Proposal: Erection of first floor side extension and single storey rear extension
Officer: Mrs Kerrie Charles

Recommendation: Refused

6/2018/0225/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 a resubmission following planning application 6/2017/1476/HOUSE, which was refused 3rd October 2017 for "Erection of 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>Planning</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2017/1476/HOUSE Decision: Refused Decision Date: 03 October 2017</p> <p>Proposal: Erection of first floor front, side and rear extensions</p> <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: 0	Other: 1
Publicity	<p>Press Advert Display Date: 7 February 2018 Press Advert Expiry Date: 21 February 2018</p>		

Summary of neighbour responses	No.33 Selwyn Crescent raises their concerns to their potential loss of light.
Consultees and responses	None
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 <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	
Main Issues	
Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)	<p>The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension and a first floor side extension.</p> <p>The proposal follows planning application 6/2017/1476/HOUSE, which was refused on 3rd October 2017 for "Erection of a first floor front and two storey side and rear extensions.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the application to reduce the size of the side extension in width to retain a 1 metre gap to the boundary at first floor and replace some of the original proposed depth with a single storey rear extension.</p> <p>The proposed extensions would be located to the rear and side of the dwelling, and would be visible within the street scene. Although the size has been reduced it is still considered to appear an over prominent feature particularly when viewed from the side. Accordingly, this proposal also is considered to represent a poor standard of design and over development within the plot.</p> <p>The councils design SPG requires all multi-storey, two-storey and first floor side extensions, to maintain a minimum distance of 1m to the adjoining flank boundary; it is important that existing spacing in the street scene is reflected in new developments which may result in larger distances being required in some instances. This spacing is to prevent over development across plot widths and a terracing effect within areas of detached and semi-detached properties and 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 would have a separation distance but by doing this it has created an awkwardly designed roof and an extension that fails to be subordinate.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The proposal further conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of design.</p>
Impact on neighbours	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

	<p>to the common boundary, the first floor element, would not be unduly dominant or result in loss of light to this adjacent property.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Access, car parking and highway considerations	<p>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.</p>
Landscaping Issues	<p>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 physically encroach onto the proposed extension, this conflict does not appear to have been considered.</p> <p>Should the application be approved a condition should be placed on the permission requiring the applicant to submit a Tree Protection Statement for the tree(s) either on, adjacent to, 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.</p> <p>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 start on site.</p>
Any other considerations	<p>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 setting of the heritage asset (the listed building) would be preserved.</p>
Conclusion	
<p>The proposed development, by virtue of its scale and proximity to the flank boundary, would result in overdevelopment across the plot width and depth of site, would fail to reflect the established spacing of dwellings adjacent to and in the immediate locality of the site and represents 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.</p>	

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 and depth of site, would fail to reflect the established spacing of dwellings adjacent to and in the immediate locality of the site and represents 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

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
1267:01		Plans and Elevations as Existing	24 January 2018
1267:02		Plans and Elevations as Proposed	24 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 Michael Robinson
21 March 2018