

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2018/1852/HOUSE
Location: 5 Cornflower Way Hatfield AL10 9FY
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension
Officer: Ms Lucy Hale

Recommendation: Granted

6/2018/1852/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is located on the north side of Cornflower Way and consists of semi-detached dwelling. The immediate area is residential in character and features dwellings of similar character and appearance.</p> <p>The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension. Planning permission is required by virtue of the removal of permitted development rights under condition 16 of the original planning application reference S6/1999/0884/FP and further revised planning application reference 6/2001/0577/FP.</p>
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) Wards - Hatfield Villages</p>
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: 6/2018/1392/PN8 Decision: Refused Decision Date: 28 June 2018 Proposal: Prior approval for the erection of a single storey rear extension measuring 4 m in depth, 3 m in height, 3 m to the eaves</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2001/0577/FP Decision: Approval Subject to s106 Decision Date: 24 July 2003 Proposal: Residential development comprising 370 dwellings, new roads, cycleways, footpaths, landscaping and public open space (revision to planning permission S6/1999/0884/FP)</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1999/0884/FP Decision: Approval Subject to s106 Decision Date: 30 June 2000 Proposal: Residential development comprising 370 dwellings, new roads, cycleways, footpaths, landscaping and public open space. Condition 16: Permitted development rights falling within Classes A (extensions), B (alteration to roof), D (porches) or F (hard surface) of Part 1 or Classes A (gates, fence or wall) or B (access to a highway) of Part 2 to Schedule 2 were removed by way of condition.</p>

Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Publicity	Neighbour letters		
Summary of neighbour responses	None		
Consultees and responses	None		
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			
<u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016:</u> SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design 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 preserved or enhanced?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
Comment (if applicable):			
Would the development reflect the character of the area?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
Comment (if applicable): The extension would remain subordinate in scale and would relate to the design of the existing extensions to the dwelling by virtue of its depth, roof form and materials. The proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.			
Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A			
Comment (if applicable): see above.			
Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A			
Comment (if applicable): No objections have been received from either adjoining occupier. The extension would be of single storey nature featuring a flat roof design, which would extend up to the shared boundary with No.3 Cornflower Way. Given the siting, scale and design of the extension, it is not considered to result in a detrimental impact on the living conditions of either neighbouring occupier in regards to loss of light, overbearing impact or loss of privacy.			
Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A			
Comment (if applicable): There would be no loss of parking as a result of the proposal and the number of bedrooms would not increase, therefore, no objections are raised with regard to on-site parking provision.			

Conclusion

The proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, and it would not result in any significantly detrimental impacts on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and is in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Policies, SP9, SADM11 and SADM12 of the Emerging Local Plan 2016, the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

DRAWING NUMBERS

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
LDP/413/01/A		Existing Floor Plans	8 August 2018
LDP/413/02/A		Existing front and Side Elevations	16 July 2018
LDP/413/03/A		Existing Rear and Side Elevations	8 August 2018
LDP/413/04/A		Existing Site Plan	8 August 2018
LDP/413/05/A		Proposed Floor Plans	8 August 2018
LDP/413/06/A		Proposed Front and Side Elevations	8 August 2018
LDP/413/07/A		Proposed Rear and Side Elevations	8 August 2018
LDP/413/08/A		Proposed Site Plan	8 August 2018
Location Plan		Location Plan	16 July 2018
LDP/413/09/A		Existing and Proposed Block Plans	8 August 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 paragraph 38 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.
2. The granting of this permission does not convey or imply any consent to build upon or access from any land not within the ownership of the applicant.

3. The applicant is advised to take account the provisions of The Party Wall Act 1996 insofar as the carrying out of development affecting or in close proximity to a shared boundary.

Determined By:

Mr Mark Peacock
1 October 2018