

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2019/0753/HOUSE

Location: 24 Manor Road Hatfield AL10 9LJ

Proposal: Erection of part single part two storey rear extension

Officer: Ms Lucy Hale

Recommendation: Granted

6/2019/0753/HOUSE

Context	Les .				
Site and Application description	The application site is located on the north west side of Manor Road and comprises of a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The property benefits from a loft conversion with a rear dormer. The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a part single part first floor rear extension.				
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) Wards - Hatfield Villages				
Relevant	None				
planning history					
Consultations	Compared 0	Object: 0	Oth are 0		
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 2	Other: 0		
Publicity	Site Notice Display Date: 15 April 2019 Site Notice Expiry Date: 9 May 2019				
Summary of neighbour responses	 23 Manor Road – Objection: Sunlight and daylight impact to bedroom and kitchen Overbearing Drainage Roof extends over the parapet wall 				
Consultees and responses	Hertfordshire County Council Rights of Way – No comment				
Relevant Policies					
 NPPF □ D1 □ GBSP1 □ GBSP2 □ M14 □ Supplementary Design Guidance □ Supplementary Parking Guidance □ Interim Policy for car parking and garage sizes ○ Others: D8 □ Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016 □ 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?				
☐ Yes ☑ No				
Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be preserved or enhanced?				
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A				
Comment (if applicable):				
Would the development reflect the character of the area?				
Comment (if applicable):				
The extension would appear subordinate in scale by virtue of it being set in from the east flank elevation and set down of the roofs ridge height. The extension has been designed to respect the character and appearance of the application property by virtue of its hipped roof design, matching materials and fenestration detailing. The extension would not be highly visible from Manor Road, however, views would be gained from public vantage points to the rear. There are examples of similar extensions, with rear dormers along Manor Road. As a result, the proposal is not considered to appear incongruous or out of keeping. The proposed development is not considered to result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.				
Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?				
Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)				
∑ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A Comment (if applicable):				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
The application property is semi-detached and adjoins No.23 Manor Road, which is located to the east of the application property. No.23 have raised an objection to the proposal and submitted further comments following re-consultation. These comments are summarised above.				
Amendments have been sought during the application process to reduce the width of first floor extension which initially proposed to build up to the shared boundary with No.23. The extension has now been set in approximately 2.1 metres. The extension measures approximately 3 metres in depth at first floor and 4.6 metres in depth at ground floor.				

Whilst the dwelling would extend further into the rear garden at two storey when compared to the existing situation, the siting and scale of the new first floor extension in relation to No.23 would not impinge upon a 45 degree angle measured from the centre of the nearest habitable window (splayed towards the siting of the new extension). The extension crosses a 38 degree angle which falls well below. Whilst on its own this is not conclusive, a 45 degree angle is a commonly used indicator of an acceptable relationship between properties. Given the orientation of the properties, where the rear elevations face broadly north east, much of the direct sunlight is blocked by the siting of the properties as the sun moves from east to west throughout the day. There may be a degree of overshadowing in the late afternoon and early evening, however, it is not considered that this amount would be detrimental to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupier or pose an uncommon relationship between neighbouring occupiers. No concerns are raised in regard to privacy.

No.25 Manor Road is located to the west of the application site. This property forms a semi-detached pair with No.26. Given the scale of the extension and separation distance, it is not considered that

the proposal would result in a detrimental loss of light or appear unduly dominant. No first floor side elevation windows are proposed and as a result no concerns are raised in regard to privacy.

Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?

Comment (if applicable):

The proposal would result in an increase from a 4-bedroom to a 5-bedroom dwelling. In line with the Council's SPG, there is not an additional requirement for on-site car parking. It is noted that the detached garage would be demolished, however, given its size would not comply with the Council's interim garage sizes for garages to have a genuine ability of storing a car. It is evident the site relies on on-street car parking, however, this part of Manor Road is an end road that adjoins a footpath with no parking restrictions. This road is primarily used for resident parking and it is not considered that the proposal would have a severe impact on the existing car parking situation. The site does benefit from a dropped kerb and there is space to the front of the site for an on-site car parking space if required.

Any other issues

Objections have been raised from neighbouring occupiers in regard to:

- Boundary
- Drainage

The existing extension of No.23 comprises a parapet wall which appears to extend over the shared boundary of the application site. The proposed extension would extend up to the shared boundary and would not extend over the red line as indicated within the drawings. An informative is suggested so that the applicant is advised of the provisions of Party Wall Act 1996 which is a matter separate to planning permission. In addition, if there is a dispute over the location of the boundary, this would be a civil matter between the two parties involved.

In addition, drainage is covered by other legislation and therefore is given limited weight in the consideration of this application. An informative is suggested so that the applicant is aware that planning permission does not convey any consent which may be required under any legislation other than the Town and Country Planning Acts.

Conclusion

Subject to conditions, the proposed development would accord with all relevant local and national planning policies.

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
S1228/01		Existing Floor Plans	29 March 2019
S1228/02		Existing Elevations	29 March 2019
P1228/11/B		Proposed Floor Plans	14 May 2019

P1228/12/C Proposed Elevations 14 May 2019
P1228/13/A Block Plan 14 May 2019
S1228/10 Location Plan 29 March 2019

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details.

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.
- 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.
- 4. Any damage to the grass verges caused by the development/works hereby approved is the responsibility of the applicant and must be re-instated to their original condition, within one month of the completion of the development/works. If damage to the verges are not repaired then the Council and/or Highway Authority will take appropriate enforcement action to remedy any harm caused.

Determined By:

Mr Michael Robinson 28 May 2019