

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2020/2878/HOUSE  
**Location:** 53 Clover Way Hatfield AL10 9FN  
**Proposal:** Erection of single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage into habitable room  
**Officer:** Mr Sukhdeep Jhooti

**Recommendation:** Refused

6/2020/2878/HOUSE

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>The application site comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse situated on the eastern side of Clover Way. It is situated on a modern housing estate which comprises of high density housing.</p> <p>Planning permission is sought for the erection of single storey rear extension and conversion of existing garage into habitable room.</p>
<b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b>	<p>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</p>
<b>Relevant planning history</b>	<p>Application Number: S6/1999/0884/FP            Decision: Granted (PD rights removed – Classes A, B, D and F of Part 1 and Classes A or B of Part 2 to Schedule 2 of the GPDO (as amended) in the interest of visual and residential amenity, and highway safety)            Decision date: 30 June 2000            Proposal: Residential development comprising 370 dwellings, new roads, cycleways, footpaths, landscaping and public open space</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2001/1338/FP            Decision: Granted (PD rights removed-Classes A,B,D and F of Part 1 and Classes A or B of Part 2 to Schedule 2 of the GPDO (as amended) in the interest of visual and residential amenity and highway safety)            Decision Date: 28 March 2002            Proposal: Residential development comprising of 200 dwellings, new road, cycle ways, footpaths, landscaping and public open space. (Revisions to planning permissions S6/1999/0884/FP and S6/2001/0577/FP)</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2020/2153/PN8            Decision: Prior Approval Refused (Reason for refusal: permitted development rights removed)            Decision Date: 15 October 2020            Proposal: Prior approval for proposed single storey rear extension to existing residential house.</p>

<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	Neighbour notification letters		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	None received		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	Hatfield Town Council – No representations received at the time of writing this report		
<b>Relevant Policies</b>			
<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			
Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016: SP4 Transport and Travel SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM2 Highway Network and Safety SADM11 Amenity and Layout SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse			
<b>Main Issues</b>			
<b>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</b>	<p>Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan require the standard of design in all new development to be of a high quality and that all new development respects and relates to the character and context of the area in which it is proposed. These policies are expanded upon in the Council's SDG.</p> <p>The NPPF places a clear emphasis on high quality design and explains that planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way in functions, taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.</p> <p>The proposed garage conversion into a habitable room would result in the removal of the existing garage door which would be replaced with a window. It would appear the window would match existing but no elevational detail has been provided. This could be secured by condition in the event of planning approval. The garage conversion into a habitable room with a window subject to the window matching the existing house would appear acceptable when viewed from the streetscene.</p> <p>The proposed single storey rear extension would be built from complementary materials and would appear proportionate to the size of the application dwelling and rear garden area. The proposed rooflights would not over-dominate the roofslope of the proposed single storey rear addition in terms of profile, design and number.</p>		
<b>Impact on neighbours</b>	<p>The proposed garage conversion into a habitable room with a window would not result in significant increases in the levels of overlooking compared with the existing situation. It is unlikely to result in greater intensification, noise nuisance and general activity compared with the existing situation to warrant refusal of planning refusal.</p> <p>The proposed single storey rear extension would be of an overall height, width and depth which would not result in a significant loss of light, outlook or privacy</p>		

	<p>when viewed from the rear garden area and habitable room glazing of number 51 Clover Way. The proposed rooflights would not cause direct overlooking of this neighbours garden area or habitable room glazing. No other neighbouring dwellings would be affected due to its size, siting and scale.</p>
<p><b>Access, car parking and highway considerations</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 105 of the NPPF states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. District Plan Policy M14 and the Parking Standards SPG use maximum standards and are not consistent with the NPPF and are therefore afforded less weight. In August 2014 the Cabinet Housing and Planning Panel approved the Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards and Garage Sizes document. This document identifies the car parking standards set out in the SPG Parking Standards as guidelines rather than maximums and states that parking provision will be assessed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The Council's Car Parking Standards SPG identifies the application site as being within Zone 4 (Zone 1 being the most accessible) where residential dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms typically require 2.25 car parking spaces.</p> <p>Under the proposals, the number of bedrooms at the dwellinghouse would rise from three to four. With this in mind, the SPG identifies that dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms typically require 3 car parking spaces. The existing garage is being lost to parking and only one car parking space is retained within the site frontage resulting in a deficit of 2 car parking spaces. Although it is accepted that the site is accessible from some facilities, it does not form one of the most accessible parts of the Borough and is not comparable to the town centres. The application site is located outside of a convenient walking distance from the nearest train station.</p> <p>Whilst the applicant has indicated only one space is in use, personal circumstances and occupants change over time. Weight is given to the potential of a 4 bedroom dwelling requiring 3 car parking spaces.</p> <p>It is considered that the potential for a displaced vehicle being parked on-street would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and the surrounding residential development. In making this assessment consideration has been given to the availability of on-street parking and the density of the surrounding development. The site has an inadequate ability to provide on-site car parking. Moreover, the imposition of a planning condition requiring an additional space would be unreasonable and would not meet the test specified in the NPPF 2019.</p> <p>The immediate streetscene of Clover Way is characterised by houses with on-site parking in the form of driveways and garages. Case Officer observation has revealed that there is parking pressure along the street at the time of the site visit. There is little opportunity for on-street parking as much of the area sees driveways, garages, narrowing of roads and a tight highway geometry, and these features limit the ability to conveniently or safely park on the highway, as well as some parking hampering the safe use of footways. Additional parking on the road is likely to add to parking pressures within the vicinity, and this would be harmful to the convenience and safety of other road users and to pedestrians.</p> <p>Furthermore, if planning permission were to be granted it would be difficult to resist similar applications from numerous other properties within the wider estate where a similar arrangement exists. Although each proposal must be considered on its own merits, consistency in decision making is a material</p>

	<p>planning consideration and required as a broad principle of good administration. Repetition of this type of development would result in a cumulative impact which would be likely to further increase the stress on parking provision within the locality resulting in a harmful effect on the character of the area.</p> <p>The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the Welwyn Hatfield Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004; and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition, the layout of the surrounding residential development would become cluttered and its overall appearance would be materially harmed by an increase in the presence of vehicles parked on-street. This adverse harm would be contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, concerning high quality design and character and context. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's core principle of securing high quality design.</p>
<b>Landscaping Issues</b>	Not applicable
<b>Any other considerations including preserved or enhanced character or appearance of Conservation Area</b>	It is noted that planning permission was refused at nearby 1 Ivy Walk, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL10 9FX on 11 January 2018 under decision reference 6/2018/0118/HOUSE due to a lack of on-site parking. The subsequent appeal was dismissed (Appeal Reference: APP/C1950/D/18/3206663).
<b>Conclusion</b>	The proposal by reason of the deficit of on-site parking for the resultant dwelling, would increase the pressure for on-street parking which would not be compatible with the maintenance and enhancement of the character of the area and accordingly fail to provide a high standard of design. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Planning Guidance for Parking Standards 2004; and the Council's Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards.

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The proposal by reason of the deficit of on-site parking for the resultant dwelling, would increase the pressure for on-street parking which would not be compatible with the maintenance and enhancement of the character of the area and accordingly fail to provide a high standard of design. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Planning Guidance for Parking Standards 2004; and the Council's Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards.

## REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
02	A	Elevations, Block and Location Plan	15 January 2021
01	A	Existing and Proposed Floorplans	15 January 2021

### 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  
28 January 2021