

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2018/0687/HOUSE
Location: 5 Bell Lane Brookmans Park Hatfield AL9 7AY
Proposal: Reconfiguration of first floor with revised roof shape and fenestration
Officer: Mr William Myers

Recommendation: Refused

6/2018/0687/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	The site is occupied by a detached chalet bungalow, the original building was a single storey bungalow which was originally granted permission in the 1960's following the demolition of a former forge which once stood on the site. Between 2007 and 2008 there were a number of applications to extend the dwelling, which resulted in bungalow being increased in height to allow a first floor element to be created. The property has a large area of hardstanding to its front and a reasonable generous garden to its rear and side.
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	LBC - LISTED BUILDING Farmhouse. Circa 1600 front range. GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0 PAR - PARISH (NORTH MYMMS) - Distance: 0 Wards - Brookmans Park & Little Heath - Distance: 0 DESC - BRICKENDON - FINCH LANE - Distance: 3.66 CP - Cycle Path (Leisure Route) - Distance: 7.53
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: E6/1962/1230/ Decision: No Information Decision Date: 31 December 1962 Proposal: Erection of bungalow and garage.</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2006/1582/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 22 January 2007 Proposal: Reconfiguration of existing roof to provide first floor accommodation, including raising of ridge and rear and front dormers, and demolition of rear single storey accommodation</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2007/1417/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 14 November 2007 Proposal: Amendments to planning application S6/2006/1582/FP which includes the addition of a chimney, enlarged dormers and other changes to window and door details</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2007/1418/FP Decision: Refused Decision Date: 14 November 2007 Proposal: Amendment to application S6/2006/1582/FP, which includes the addition of a front porch and bay window, and changes to external fenestration</p>

	Application Number: S6/2008/0219/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 24 April 2008 Proposal: Erection of single storey front extension		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Publicity	Site Notice Display Date: 12 April 2018 Site Notice Expiry Date: 3 May 2018 Press Advert Display Date: 28 March 2018 Press Advert Expiry Date: 11 April 2018		
Consultees and responses	North Mymms Parish Council – The application would result in a loss of character and be over-dominant in the street scene. It also exceeds the Green Belt policy for an increase in size. Cadent Gas Limited – No objection		
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 <u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission 2016</u> SP3 Settlement Strategy and Green Belt Boundaries SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM11 Amenity and Layout SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse SADM15 Heritage SP25 Rural Development SADM34 Development within the Green Belt			
Main Issues			
Green Belt	<p>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. In the Green Belt, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. The extension of an existing building is not, however, inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. There is no definition of ‘disproportionate additions’ in the NPPF. The ‘original building’ is as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1948, as it was built originally. Neither the Local Plan nor the NPPF provide any detailed guidance on how to determine whether an extension is disproportionate. This is, therefore, ultimately a matter for the decision maker and demands that each proposal is considered in relation to the size and character of the original building. The proposed increase in volume, footprint and floor area are commonly used indicators, however, as well as mathematical calculations, the</p>		

visual impact of the extension has to be considered. The Council's current Policy RA3 and emerging Local Policy SADM34 require that extensions in the Green Belt do not have an adverse visual impact (in terms of prominence, size, bulk and design) on the character, appearance and pattern of development of the surrounding countryside.

The planning records demonstrate that the original building, as granted permission in 1962, had a floor area of approximately 213m² and it was a single storey bungalow with a height of approximately 4.1m. In 2007 permission was granted for reduction in the overall foot print of the building but for the increasing of the ridge height of the bungalow by 2 metres and for habitable accommodation to be created in the extended roof space. It is important to note that although permission was granted on this basis, the site visit and application drawings indicate that the existing dwelling on site does not accord with the approved drawings. This is because the submitted plans for this application show the existing building has a footprint of 214m² and the applicant's own calculations for the existing building state that the footprint of the building is 214m². Another important point to address here is that the applicant has stated within their supporting document titled 'Comparative Areas & Volumes' that the existing external area of the first floor of the property is 214m², it is unclear how this figure has been arrived at because the submitted plans do not demonstrate this. Instead when these plans are measured they demonstrate that the external area at first floor level measures approximately 180m². As the proposed extensions would increase the external area at first floor level by 36m², the proposed extensions and alterations would result in the extended building having a total external area at first floor level of approximately 214m². When this increase is added to the previous extensions it would result in the proposed dwelling having a floor area which would be 100% larger than that of the original building.

Cumulatively, on a purely mathematical calculation the extensions to the original building would be disproportionate. However, in addition to mathematical calculations the visual impact of the extensions has to be considered.

Further to the above discussions about the proposed increases, it is considered that the proposed additions to the existing dwelling, which has already been significantly extended, would have a harmful impact on the openness of Green Belt. The proposed extensions would harm the openness of the Green Belt due to its impact in terms of prominence, size, bulk and design on the character and appearance of the area. These points are discussed in further detail within the following section of this report. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence and the loss of openness in the Green Belt resulting from the proposed extensions would conflict with this essential characteristic. Significant weight must be attached to this loss of openness.

The proposal would add further development to an already disproportionately extended dwelling. For the reasons discussed, the proposal fails to meet the exceptions set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF. It would, therefore, be inappropriate development in, and thus harmful to, the Green Belt. It would also conflict, with Local Plan Policy RA3 and emerging Policy SADM34, which seek, among other things, to ensure that extensions, either alone or cumulatively with other extensions, do not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. Furthermore, the increased

	<p>bulk and massing of the proposed development would result in a loss of openness and visual permeability of the Green Belt.</p>
<p>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</p>	<p>Local Plan Policies D1 and D2 aim to ensure a high quality of design and to ensure that development respects and relates to the character and context of the locality, maintaining and where possible enhancing the character of the existing area. These policies are expanded upon in the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG) which requires the impact of a development to be assessed giving regard to the bulk, scale and design of the proposal and how it harmonises with the existing building and area. These objectives are broadly consistent with a core principle of the NPPF which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.</p> <p>Proposed extensions would maintain the existing height of the building but result in extensions a first floor level that would change the existing chalet bungalow into a two storey dwelling and make the first floor level the same size as the ground floor. In addition, proposals would significantly reduce the pitch of the main roof and would change the roof slope on the eastern flank of the building from a dual pitched roof to a mono pitched roof, which would slope in an easterly direction. These changes would fundamentally alter the character of the dwellinghouse on the site, by creating a dwelling that would be substantially different to the modest chalet bungalow which currently exist. For these reasons the proposed increases in the bulk and scale of the dwelling at first floor level would not amount to additions that would be subservient or subordinate to than the existing building. In addition, the proposed external material of the dwelling and fenestration pattern would be significantly different to the existing dwelling. Although such materials and fenestration detailing may be acceptable in some cases it is considered that in the case these changes are another indication of how the proposed development would fundamentally alter the character of the existing dwelling.</p> <p>Overall the proposed development would be excessive in size and would represent a poor standard of design with the result that it is contrary to the NPPF and Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan which attach great importance to the design of the built environment and the SDG which seeks a design led approach to development.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>It is considered given that the siting of the dwelling within the site and its proximity to neighbouring properties that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.</p>
<p>Access, car parking and highway considerations</p>	<p>As the proposed extension would make the property on site a five bedroom dwelling, it is important that the Council Parking SPG and Interim Parking Standards are considered. Given the location of the application site and the number of bedrooms proposed it is considered that the development should seek to provide three off street car parking spaces in this case.</p> <p>Although the submitted plans do not provide any details of the future parking provision on site, it is important to note that nothing within the submitted plans indicates that there would be any material change to the parking provision at the front of the property. It was observed as part of the site visit that the property currently benefits from a large area of hardstanding at the front of the property and that this area can accommodate more than three car parking</p>

	spaces. As a consequence, there is no objection to the proposal on these grounds.
<p>Any other considerations</p>	<p><i>Very Special Circumstances</i></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 harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The applicant has not advanced very special circumstances for this application. As a consequence, it is considered that there are no very special circumstances that outweigh the harm to the Green Belt that was identified above.</p> <p><i>Original Building</i></p> <p>The applicant has stated that he considers that the original building on the site should be considered as being the former forge building which was demolished before the erection of the bungalow in the 1960's and not the bungalow.</p> <p>It is not in dispute that the bungalow was erected following the demolition of a former Forge that once stood on the site. As the previous building (the former forge) was demolished before the erection of the bungalow this building ceased to exist by the early 1960's and was replaced by a single storey bungalow that stood on the site unchanged until 2007. In line with the NPPF (Annex 2: Glossary (p.54), it is considered that the original building in this case is the bungalow that was granted permission in the 1960's and not former forge.</p> <p><i>Setting of a listed building</i></p> <p>As part of this application a press notice was published because of the possible affect that the development may have on the listed buildings to the rear of the site. The possible impacts on these listed buildings have been assessed as part of this application and it has been considered that the proposed extension would not have an unacceptable impact on the listed buildings. The reasons for this are that there are a number of mature trees between the proposed extension and the listed buildings, the separation distance between the extensions and the nearest listed building would be approximately 75m.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>The proposal would represent inappropriate development within the Green Belt. In addition to this harm, there would also be harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Consequently the proposed development would conflict with Policy GBSP1 and RA3 of the saved Local Plan, Policy SADM34 of the Emerging Local Plan and relevant provisions of the NPPF.</p> <p>The proposed extensions would be of a poor quality of design and they would insufficiently reflect the design and character of the host dwelling. In addition, the extensions would not be subordinate or subservient to the existing building and would be excessive in size. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 (Statement of Council Policy 2005) and National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p>	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed extension together with existing extensions, would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building, as such the proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Furthermore, the proposed extension would harm the openness of the Green Belt due to its impact in terms of prominence, size, bulk and design on the character and appearance of the area. Very special circumstances do not exist to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Accordingly the proposal is contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy GBSP1, GBPP2 and RA3 of the adopted Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and Policies SP3, SP25 and SADM34 of the Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission 2016.
2. The proposed extensions would be of a poor quality of design and they would insufficiently reflect the design and character of the host dwelling. In addition, the extensions would not be subordinate or subservient to the existing building and would be excessive in size. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

3.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
Location Plan		Site Location Plan	12 March 2018
167801	B	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	12 March 2018
167802	B	Proposed First Floor & Roof Plan	12 March 2018
167804	B	Proposed Elevations And Sections	12 March 2018
1678003		Existing Elevations And Sections	12 March 2018
1678002		Existing First Floor & Roof Plan	12 March 2018
1678001		Existing Ground Floor & Block Plan	12 March 2018
1678006		Plans & Section As Built In Late 18th Century	12 March 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
9 May 2018