

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2020/1768/HOUSE
Location: 57 The Ridgeway, Cuffley, Potters Bar, EN6 4BD
Proposal: Increase ridge height to provide full first floor. Two storey side and rear extensions, with front porch canopy.
Officer: Mr David Elmore

Recommendation: Refused

6/2020/1768/HOUSE

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The description of the proposed works as stated on the application form is for <i>'Increase ridge height to provide full first floor. Two storey side and rear extensions, with front porch canopy'</i>.</p> <p>The submitted drawings however show a part single/part two storey front extension, two storey side extension, increase in the height of the dwelling and alterations to its roof. The proposed development will be determined accordingly.</p>		
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0 LCA - Landscape Character Area (Northaw Great Wood) - Distance: 0 LCA - Landscape Character Area (Northaw Common Parkland) - Distance: 0 LNR - Local Nature Reserve(Northaw Great Wood) - Distance: 14.58 PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 14.58 Wards - Northaw & Cuffley - Distance: 0 A4D - ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - Distance: 14.58</p>		
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/2008/0787/FP Decision: Refused & Dismissed at Appeal Decision Date: 04 July 2008 Proposal: Alterations to roof, incorporating part raising of roof line and new front dormer to increase first floor accommodation space</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2007/1207/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 03 October 2007 Proposal: Erection of a first floor rear extension, alterations to roof to include two dormer windows to front elevation, following demolition of existing dormer window</p> <p>Application Number: E6/1954/0746/ Decision: Granted Decision Date: 22 June 1954 Proposal: Bungalow and private garage.</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0

Publicity	Neighbour letters sent
Summary of neighbour responses	<p>Anonymous objection received and summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of character with dwelling and area • Loss of light to the neighbouring sides • Overshadowing • Loss of privacy from first floor side windows
Consultees and responses	No representations received
Relevant Policies	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GBSP1 <input type="checkbox"/> GBSP2 <input type="checkbox"/> M14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Design Guidance <input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary Parking Guidance <input type="checkbox"/> Interim Policy for car parking and garage sizes Others: Policies RA3 and RA10 of the District Plan	
Main Issues	
Green Belt	<p>The application site lies with the Green Belt. Policy GBSP1 of the District Plan states that the Green Belt will be maintained in the Borough as defined in the Proposals Map.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>Paragraph 145 of the NPPF outlines that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt, apart from a limited number of exceptions. One of these exceptions is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This approach is broadly consistent with Policy RA3 of the District Plan.</p> <p>Neither the District Plan or NPPF provide any detailed guidance on how to determine whether an extension is disproportionate. This is, therefore, ultimately a planning judgement of fact and degree, which demands that each proposal is considered in relation to the size and appearance of the original building. The proposed increase in volume, footprint and floor area are commonly used indicators, however, as well as mathematical calculations, the visual impact of the extension has to be considered.</p> <p>The NPPF defines “original building” as a building as it existed in July 1948 or, if constructed after that date, as it was originally built.</p> <p>The original building was a bungalow with a footprint (and floor area) of approximately 146sqm. It had a hip roof which was stepped at the ridge giving the building a height of between 6.1-7.4 metres.</p> <p>A side and rear ‘infill’ extension and front, side and rear dormer were added. Following this, in 2007, planning permission was granted under application number S6/2007/1207/FP for a first floor rear extension and enlargements to the roof to provide a flush ridge line and additional front dormer.</p> <p>The proposed extensions and alterations would transform the current ‘chalet-style’ dwelling into a two storey property with crown roof. The resultant dwelling would have a footprint of approximately 164sqm (12.3% increase over original, floor area of approximately 328sqm (124.6% increase over original) and height of 7.2 metres.</p> <p>The increase in floor area above original would be significant and, in visual</p>

	<p>term, the resultant dwelling would be considerably greater in scale and bulk than the original building.</p> <p>Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The proposal would therefore represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt.</p> <p><i>Openness</i></p> <p>The subject dwelling forms part of a ribbon of detached dwellings on the southern side of The Ridgeway with open countryside to the rear. The proposal would increase the height of the flank walls from single to two storey and create a large crown roof. Such additions would reduce the gaps between the dwelling and the neighbouring buildings and significantly increase the presence of the dwelling in the street scene. This would result in a reduction in the visual permeability and openness of this Green Belt location, closing down glimpsed views of the countryside beyond.</p>
<p>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</p>	<p>Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan respectively require high quality design in all new development and for proposals to respect and relate to the character and context of their location, maintaining and where possible enhancing the character of the existing area.</p> <p>The NPPF advocates high quality design and that permission should be refused for development of poor design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area the way it functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.</p> <p>The Council's Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 (SDG) expands on Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan and outlines, amongst other things, that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensions should be designed to complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling and be subordinate in scale; • The spacing of buildings adjacent to and in the immediate locality of the site should be reflected; and • For all two-storey side extensions, a minimum distance of 1 metre between the extension and the adjoining flank boundary must be maintained. This spacing is to prevent overdevelopment across plot widths and a terracing effect within areas of detached and semi-detached properties <p>This part of The Ridgeway contains a mixture of broadly chalet-style and two storey dwellings. Whilst the resultant two storey dwelling would be in keeping with the area's built context and a minimum distance of 1 metre between the extension and the adjoining flank boundary would be maintained, its size, design and appearance would contrast greatly with that of the existing dwelling. The proposal would therefore fail to complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling or be subordinate in scale in conflict with Policy D1 of the District Plan, SDG and NPPF.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>The proposed extensions would not be unduly dominant or result in any adverse loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties considering their height, length of projection and proximity to common boundaries.</p> <p>The upper floor side walls would be void of window openings. As such, there would be no loss of privacy toward the flank windows of the next door</p>

	properties. Views from the upper floor front and rear windows would be consistent with a relationship generally expected between residential properties.
Other considerations	<p><i>'Very special circumstances'?</i></p> <p>Paragraph 143 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>Paragraph 144 of the NPPF goes on to state 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 resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The proposal would represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and result in a loss of Green Belt openness. In accordance with the NPPF, substantial weight is attached to this harm. Considerable weight is also attached to the harm caused by the development to the design and character of the existing dwelling.</p> <p>No very special circumstances have been advanced by the applicant to clearly outweigh any harm to the Green Belt and the local planning authority consider that no very special circumstances exist in this case.</p>
Conclusion	
<p>The proposal would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and, therefore, represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. There would also be a loss of Green Belt openness given the scale and location of the proposal. No very special circumstances exist to clearly outweigh this harm. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies GBSP1 and RA3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The proposed development would fail to complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling and be subordinate in scale. Consequently, the proposal would represent a poor standard of design in conflict with Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building and, therefore, represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt. There would also be a loss of Green Belt openness given the scale and location of the proposal. No very special circumstances exist to clearly outweigh this harm. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies GBSP1 and RA3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development would fail to complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling and be subordinate in scale. Consequently, the proposal would represent a poor standard of design in conflict with Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

3.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
LP01		Location Plan	20 July 2020
SP02		Existing Site Plan	20 July 2020
E100		Existing Ground & First Floor Plans	20 July 2020
SP01		Proposed Site Plan	20 July 2020
P101		Proposed Ground & First Floor Plans	20 July 2020
E101		Existing Elevations	20 July 2020
P102		Proposed Elevations	20 July 2020

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).

Determined By:

Mr Mark Peacock
14 September 2020