

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2018/0371/HOUSE
Location: Stocks Lysley Place Brookmans Park Hatfield AL9 6NZ
Proposal: Erection of single storey side extension following demolition of double garage
Officer: Ms Lucy Hale

Recommendation: Granted

6/2018/0371/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The site is located to the north east side of Lysley Place within the former Queenswood Home Farm. The site consists of a detached dwelling with a detached double garage which was converted from a stock barn. The dwelling has previously been extended by way of a single storey rear extension creating an L-shape layout. Lysley Place comprises of large detached dwellings of similar character and appearance.</p> <p>The site has had its permitted development rights withdrawn at the time of granting planning permission for the conversion to residential dwelling.</p> <p>The application seeks planning permission for the erection of single storey side extension following the demolition of a detached double garage. It should be noted that this scheme is identical to the previous scheme (S6/2011/1397/FP). Permission has now lapsed as works have not commenced.</p>
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>GB - Greenbelt LCA - Landscape Character Area (North Mymms Common and Newgate Street Farmed Plateau) PAR - PARISH (NORTH MYMMS) Wards - Brookmans Park & Little Heath</p>
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/2011/1397/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 21 September 2011 Proposal: Erection of single storey extension and removal of existing double garage</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2010/2735/FP Decision: Refused Decision Date: 22 December 2010 Proposal: Erection of single storey extension</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2005/1233/FP Decision: Refused Decision Date: 28 November 2005 Proposal: Erection of single storey side extension</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2002/0202/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 05 February 2002 Proposal: Erection of timber gates with maximum height of 2.15m</p>

	Application Number: S6/2000/1062/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 23 October 2000 Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension and alterations to front porch Application Number: S6/1997/0815/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 13 March 1998 Proposal: Demolition of 3 No. dwelling houses and agricultural buildings, conversion of coach house and barns to 3 No. residential units, construction of 3 No. dwelling houses, and car parking.		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0
Publicity	Site Notice Display Date: 16 February 2018 Site Notice Expiry Date: 9 March 2018 Neighbour Letters Expiry Date: 27 February 2018		
Summary of neighbour responses	North Mymms District Green Belt Society - this application should conform to Green Belt policy and that permitted development rights must be removed.		
Consultees and responses	North Mymms Parish Council - This proposal must conform to Green Belt requirements and that permitted development rights must be removed.		
Relevant Policies			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input checked="" 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: RA3, RA10 <u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission 2016:</u> SP3 Settlement Strategy and Green Belt boundaries SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM 11 Amenity and Layout SADM 12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse SADM 34 Development within the Green Belt			
Main Issues			
Principle of the development within the Green Belt	<p>Paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identifies the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. There is a presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt, outlined in paragraph 87. Paragraph 89 clarifies that an extension or alteration to a building, providing it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy RA3 is in line with the NPPF in that it is concerned with the impact created by extensions on the openness of the Green Belt, yet recognises that the extension of a dwelling may be considered appropriate development so long as the development would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling (i). Policy RA3 goes on to state that the visual impact of a development, in terms of prominence, bulk size and design, on the character, appearance and pattern of development of the surrounding countryside is an important consideration in assessing a proposal (ii). Permission will only be allowed where criteria (i) and (ii) of Policy RA3 are met.</p> <p>The previous application was granted permission under S6/2011/1397/FP for</p>		

the erection of single storey side extension following the demolition of a detached double garage. This application is an identical scheme and has been submitted as the time period has lapsed and works have not commenced on site. It is noted that the previous application followed a refused permission under S6/2010/2735/FP, which didn't include the demolition of the garage. The dwelling has been previously extended with a rear extension of with a floor area of approximately 63 sqm. The original dwelling has a floor area of approximately 116 sqm and therefore the dwelling has been increased by approximately 54%.

The proposed extension would have a floor area of approximately 22 sqm and the resultant dwelling would have a floor area of approximately 202.5 sqm. Therefore, the resultant increase in floor area would equate to 74.6% when compared to the original dwelling.

Within the emerging Draft Local Plan 2016, Policy SADM 34 outlines that in the case of extensions to residential dwellings, these will need to avoid being disproportionate to the size of the original dwelling. Applications will be refused where the extension would either by itself or taken together with extant permission and previous extensions make the extensions disproportionate. When assessing what would constitute a disproportionate extension to a building, a quantitative and qualitative assessment will be undertaken. In quantitative terms proposals would result in footprint, volume, and or above ground dimensions (height/width) of a building being 50% greater than the original building would generally be refused. Using this as a benchmark, the resultant floor area of 74.6% would be considered as disproportionate.

A quantitative assessment is not the only measure, a qualitative assessment is also taken into consideration. The extension is of single storey nature and is fairly modest in depth and width, continuing the form of the existing dwelling, however, the dwelling benefits from an existing large extension. The original dwelling was modest 3 bedroom bungalow which has already benefitted from a large rear extension, creating an 'L' shape dwelling which has already significantly increased the bulk and mass. When taking into consideration the proposed extension with the existing extension and alterations to the dwelling, these would result in a cumulative impact which would be disproportionate to the original dwelling.

The proposal is therefore regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt which is by definition, substantially harmful to the Green Belt contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy RA3(i) of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan and Policy SADM 34 of the Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission 2016.

Openness

In terms of the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and its visual amenity, the NPPF identifies in paragraph 79 that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

The second criterion of Policy RA3 requires extensions not to have an adverse visual impact on the character, appearance and pattern of development in the surrounding countryside.

In terms of the effect of the side extension on the openness of the Green Belt, the proposed increase in volume would materially increase the bulk and mass of development on the site thereby reducing the openness of the Green Belt. Whilst it is noted that the extension would not be highly visible from public

	<p>vantage points, the presence of the proposed extension combined with the existing extensions of such size, would detract from the openness of the Green Belt and thereby conflict with one of its essential characteristics.</p> <p>'Very special circumstances' have been advanced, which is addressed below.</p>
<p>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</p>	<p>Policy RA10 states that proposals for development in the rural areas will be expected to contribute, as appropriate, to the conservation, maintenance and enhancement of the local landscape character of the area in which they are located. The application site is located within the North Mymms Common and Newgate Street Formed Plateau Landscape Character Area. The objectives of the landscape character area are to conserve and restore. Taking into consideration the size of the proposal and location of the site and its boundary treatment, it is not considered to detrimentally impact on the objectives of the North Mymms Common and Newgate Street Formed Plateau Landscape Character Area which complies with Policy RA10 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.</p> <p>Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 respectively require high quality design in all new development and for proposals to respect and relate to the character and context of their location. These policies are expanded upon in the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG) which requires that residential extensions should be complementary in design and be subordinate in size and scale to the existing dwelling.</p> <p>The extension would continue the form and ridge height of the existing dwelling and is considered to appear subordinate in scale. The architectural style, windows, detailing and materials are appropriate to the original dwelling in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and SDG 2005.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>No objections have been received.</p> <p>The proposal would be unlikely to have a significant impact on neighbouring occupiers because of the separation distances, orientation and boundary screening. In terms of impact on the living conditions and residential amenity of neighbouring properties the proposed extension would be in accordance with Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.</p>
<p>Access, car parking and highway considerations</p>	<p>The proposal would include the loss of a garage, however, the site has a large frontage which can accommodate sufficient on-site car parking. As such, no objections are raised.</p>
<p>Landscaping Issues</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Whether there are any very special circumstances that clearly outweigh any harm to the Green Belt</p>	<p>It is necessary to undertake a balancing exercise to establish whether there are very special circumstances that outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The NPPF indicates that substantial weight must be attached to inappropriate development by reason of its inappropriateness. In addition to this harm, there is a moderate harmful effect on the openness of the Green Belt. There is a lack of harm to character and appearance of the wider area, to residential amenity but these are considered to be neutral factors.</p> <p>The NPPF advises that, when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other</p>

	<p>harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted supporting information outlining that the garage is to be demolished, which would remove some of the built development within the plot. This reduction would be an attempt to offset the additional bulk and massing of the proposal.</p> <p>The garage has not been taken into account in the calculations of the dwellings floor area and it does not form a habitable area. However, it does add bulk and mass within the plot and the Draft Local Plan 2016, Policy SADM 34 outlines the volume or footprint of existing buildings to be demolished within the site may be offset against increases in volume and footprint, taking into account the size, permanence, design and proximity to the building to be extended. Furthermore, it outlines that buildings within 5 metres of the main dwelling will be treated as an extension to the main dwelling.</p> <p>The existing detached garage has a floor space of approximately 29.6 sqm and whilst ancillary, is positioned approximately 4.5 metres away from the dwelling. The garage measures approximately 5.5 metres in width by 4.9 metres in depth. When considering the quantitative calculations the existing garage has a floor space of 29.6 sqm compared to the proposed extension of 22 sqm, which equates to a reduced floor space than existing. It is also important to consider a qualitative comparison. The garage is located to the front of the dwelling and is attached to the neighbouring garage. It is considered that the existing garage contributes to the spread of the development within the plot and an impact on openness as a result of its size, roof form and siting. Whilst it is noted that the proposed extension would feature a gable end, which would add bulk to the appearance of the dwelling, the extension has been designed to relate to the form and ridge height of the existing dwelling. The location to the side of the dwelling confines the spread of the development and the removal of the garage would contribute to an increase in openness between the application dwelling and the adjoining site.</p> <p>On balance, it is considered that the impact of the proposed extension would be sufficiently mitigated by the removal of garage. The circumstances presented would outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by way of appropriateness and therefore 'very special circumstances' exist.</p>
--	---

Conclusion

The application follows a previously granted scheme reference S6/2011/1397/FP. The proposed extension, when considered cumulatively with existing extensions, would result in a dwelling that would be disproportionate in size. The proposed demolition of double garage would offset the size of the proposed extension, resulting in a development within the plot of similar bulk and massing to that existing. As it considered that there would be no overall increased impact upon the openness of the Green Belt, the demolition of the garage therefore constitutes 'very special circumstances' that would outweigh the harm and inappropriateness of the proposed extension.

Conditions:

1. Prior to construction of the extension hereby permitted, the existing double garage to the western side of the site shall be demolished and all the materials arising from such demolition shall be completely removed from the site.

REASON: The site lies outside of established settlement limits and therefore within an area where only limited extensions are allowed to dwellings. The Local Planning Authority would not be prepared to permit inappropriate extensions to the main dwelling or outbuildings within the plot, which would cumulatively affect the openness and of the Green Belt and be disproportionate to the original dwelling. Therefore, the removal of existing built development (the garage) is necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies RA3, 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:

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
SLP 3000		Site Location Plan	2 February 2018
PL-1000		Existing Ground Floor Plan & Elevations	2 February 2018
PL-2000		Proposed Ground Floor & Elevations	2 February 2018
PL-3000		Existing & Proposed Block plan	2 February 2018

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).

Determined By:

Mr Mark Peacock
29 March 2018