

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

## **DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2019/1874/HOUSE

**Location:** 64 Gorseway Hatfield AL10 9GS **Proposal:** Erection of single storey rear extension

Officer: Mr A Commenville

**Recommendation**: Granted

## 6/2019/1874/HOUSE

Context					
Site and Application description	The application site comprises a terraced detached two-storey dwelling with a pitched roof located within the western side of Gorseway.  The applicant seeks permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension.				
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) - Distance: 0 Wards - Hatfield Villages - Distance: 0 A4HD - Article 4 HMO Direction - Distance: 0 HAT - Hatfield Aerodrome - Distance: 0 HHAA - Hatfield Heritage Assessment Area(Hatfield Garden Village) - Distance: 0				
Relevant planning history	None relevant.				
Consultations					
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 1		
Publicity	Neighbour notification letters				
Summary of neighbour responses	One letter of representation has been received from No. 62 Gorseway raising the following concerns:  - The development may affect the natural daylight coming into my lounge area.  - The solid brick wall of the extension will be very close to the dividing garden boundary fence.				
Consultees and responses	No representations have been received.				
Relevant Policies					
NPPF  □ D1 □ D2 □ GBSP1 □ GBSP2 □ M14  Others: Supplementary Planning Guidance – Parking Standards, Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards and Garage Sizes					

Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016					
SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design					
SADM2 Highway Network and Safety					
SADM11 Amenity and Layout					
on bill in a market and bayout					
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?					
⊠ Yes □ No					
Comment (if applicable):					
Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?					
⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A					
Comment (if applicable):					
Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook,					
light etc.)					
⊠ Yes □ No □ N/A					
<b>Comment</b> (if applicable): The comments and concerns received from the neighbouring property at					
No.62 Gorseway with regard to the loss of light are noted. This extension, by virtue of its height,					
depth and proximity to the shared boundary would inevitably cause loss of light to that currently					
afforded to the ground floor windows of No.62 and also would have a more dominant impact.					
anorded to the ground hoor windows of two.02 and also would have a more dominant impact.					
While the proposed extension would measure 3.5 metres in depth, it would have a mono pitched roof					
measuring 2.5 metres at eaves level and 3.4 metres at its top. It is noted that if the application site					
benefits from its permitted development rights, a rear extension under permitted development could					
be erected and measure 3 metres in depth but up to 4 metres in height and 3 metres at eaves level.					
Having regard to this and having regard to the scale, siting and height of the proposed extension, it					
is on balance considered that the proposed extension would not have such degree of harm upon the					
amenities of neighbouring occupiers at No.62 or No.66 Gorseway to justify the refusal of planning					
permission.					
In light of these observations, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard and so					
complies with Policy D1 of the District Plan, the Design Guide SPG and NPPF.					
Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?					
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A					
Comment (if applicable):					
Any other issues					
It is noted that this neighbouring property commented that the single storey rear extension would be					
very close to the boundary fence. Any impact on the fence is a private matter that should be					
discussed between the neighbours and is not a planning consideration. An informative has been					
added in this regard.					
Conclusion					
The impacts of the proposed single storey rear extension have been considered on the visual					
amenity of the site and surrounding area and on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. It has been					

The impacts of the proposed single storey rear extension have been considered on the visual amenity of the site and surrounding area and on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. It has been concluded that the proposal would sufficiently preserve and relate to the character, appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding area and would not have any significantly adverse impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policies GBSP2, D1 and D2, of the District Plan, the Supplementary Design Guidance and the NPPF.

### **Conditions:**

1. The brickwork, roof tile, bond, mortar, detailing, guttering, soffits and other external decorations of the approved extension/alterations must match the existing dwelling/building in relation to colour and texture.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

#### 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
4744 OS2		Block Plan	31 July 2019
4744 P01	Α	Proposed Floor and Elevations	31 July 2019
4744 OS1		Location Plan	31 July 2019
4744 E01	Α	Existing Floor and Elevations	6 August 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 or legal interest (easements or wayleaves) which may affect the land.
- 2. 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 2019