

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/1107/HOUSE
Location: 379 St Albans Road West Hatfield AL10 9RU
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, a two storey rear, front side extension, a roof extension and insertion of a rear box dormer.
Officer: Mr Raymond Lee

Recommendation: Refused

6/2021/1107/HOUSE

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The application site comprises of a two storey semi-detached dwelling located at St Albans Road, Hatfield. The area is residential in character comprising of semi-detached dwellings uniform in character. Many of the properties in this section of St Albans Road West have extended with two storey side extensions.</p> <p>The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension, a two storey rear, front and side extension, a roof extension and insertion of a rear box dormer.</p>		
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 24.44 LCA - Landscape Character Area (De Havilland Plain) - Distance: 0 PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) - Distance: 0 Wards - Hatfield Villages - Distance: 0 WCCF - Watling Chase Community Forest - Distance: 0 A4HD - Article 4 HMO Direction - Distance: 0 HHAA - Hatfield Heritage Assessment Area(Wilkin's Green) - Distance: 0</p>		
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/2007/1604/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 18 December 2007 Proposal: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0
Publicity	Neighbour notification letters.		
Summary of neighbour responses	<p>377 St Albans Road West – Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact on the front elevation; • Changes to the streetscape by altering both the hip roof to a gable end and also the two storey extension to the front affecting the character of the 		

	<p>building and roofline;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projection of Rear Single Storey Extension; • Objection to the additional 3m extension to the party wall side of the building on the grounds that it will overshadow the living room, reduce light levels and visual amenity. • Overall are these proposals an over development of the site, with little regard for the existing character of the properties in the street.
<p>Consultees and responses</p>	<p>Hatfield Town Council – Objection: <i>‘Members consider the roof to be too dominant due to its extension. The development creates overlooking of adjoining properties, adversely affecting neighbours. The proposed development is out of keeping with neighbouring properties’.</i></p>
<p>Relevant Policies</p>	
<p><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 Others</p> <p><u>Emerging Local Plan 2016</u> SP1 Delivering Sustainable Development SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM 11 Amenity and Layout SADM 12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse</p>	
<p>Main Issues</p>	
<p>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</p>	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) chapter 12 emphasises the importance of good design as a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 124 advises that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph 127 the NPPF further advises that decisions should ensure developments will function well, be visually attractive, sympathetic to local character and establish a strong sense of place. Paragraph 130 is clear that “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 it functions...”.</p> <p>District Plan Policy GBSP2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 notes that development within the specified settlements will be limited to that which is compatible with the maintenance and enhancement of their character. Policies D1 and D2 aim to ensure a high quality of design and to ensure that development respects and relates to the character and context of the locality, maintaining and where possible enhancing the character of the existing area. These policies are expanded upon in the Council’s Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG) which requires the impact of a development to be assessed giving regard to the bulk, scale and design of the proposal and how it harmonises with the existing building and area.</p> <p>In this case, substantial extensions are proposed to the original building. Although the footprint of the proposed development in comparison to the size of the plot is not considered to result in overdevelopment of the site, given the significant bulk that would be added to the front, side and rear of the building at</p>

	<p>both ground and first floor level, it is not considered that these additions would be subordinate or subservient to the original dwelling.</p> <p>Whilst the principle of a well designed two storey side extension is not unacceptable in the area given the various examples that could be found along the street, in this instance the proposed two storey side extension would alter the current characteristic hipped roof to a much more prominent gable end that would visually unbalance the pair of semi's by creating a bulky roof on one side. This in addition to the other extensions proposed to the roof would significantly increase its massing and fundamentally change the appearance of the roof form. This part of the scheme would therefore fail to respect and relate to the host dwelling and the other pairs of semi-detached properties along the row.</p> <p>In terms of the two storey front extension, due to its excessive width and off centre location, it would result in a unduly prominent feature of the principle elevation of the property and would fail to appear as a subordinate addition. Furthermore, as there are no other examples of two storey front extensions in the immediate area, this would also result in a marked change in the character and appearance of this row of semi-detached properties.</p> <p>Although the proposed two storey element of the rear extension is appropriately stepped down from the main roof ridge, its width is greater than that of the two storey part of the original dwelling and therefore it is considered to be excessive in scale. With respect to the proposed box dormer to the rear, it is important to note that the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance states that dormer windows should be contained within the roof slope, be subservient to the roof, be set in by at least 1m flank wall/party wall of the property and be in proportion to the existing fenestration. In this case, since the proposed dormer is set in only approximately 0.6m from the common boundary with No. 377, this is considered contrary to the SDG. Although it is set down from the ridge and back from the eaves, given the extent of which it spans across the building, it would not be considered a subordinate or subservient addition to the existing roof slope.</p> <p>In terms of the detailed character of the development, the size, proportions and appearance of the doors and window being proposed is not, on balance, considered to harm the appearance of the dwelling or the character of the area. It is also proposed to utilise materials that would match the existing property which could be secured via condition in the event of an approval. This does not however overcome the harm in relation to the bulk and design of the proposals identified above.</p> <p>Cumulatively, the proposed extensions would overwhelm and dominate the original building, obscuring its original design and proportions and would fail to respect the character of the area. The proposed development is therefore excessive and of a poor standard of design that is contrary to the NPPF and Policies GBPS2, D1 and D2 of the District Plan which attach great importance to the design of the built environment and the SDG which seeks a design led approach to development.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>Policy D1 of the District Plan 2005 and the SDG state that any extension should not cause loss of light or appear unduly dominant from an adjoining property or result in a detrimental loss of privacy. Policy SADM11 of the Emerging Plan aims to preserve neighbouring amenity. The most impacted</p>

	<p>neighbours would be those located to either side of the application site (No. 377 and No. 381 St Albans Road West).</p> <p>The neighbours at No. 377 have objected to the scheme on grounds of overshadowing to their living room from the single storey extension. Whilst the proposal would extend approximately 5 metres along the shared boundary with this neighbour, there is currently a circa 2m extension at No. 377 and therefore the proposal would only extend approximately 3 metres beyond their rear building line. Given that a relatively low flat roof form is proposed and the fact that No. 377's living room is served by a set of patio doors, it is not considered that this part of the scheme would result in significant loss of light or appear unduly dominating. The two storey part of the rear extension would be set in approximately 2.5m from the boundary and therefore it would not result in detrimental loss of light or outlook. In terms of privacy, whilst there are a series of side facing windows proposed which could afford views onto the neighbouring property at No. 377, since these openings serve non-habitable rooms, it would be considered reasonable and appropriate to obscure glaze these windows by condition in the event of an approval to overcome the privacy issue.</p> <p>As for the neighbour on the other side at No. 381, given the location of the development in relation to their primary windows and main amenity areas, it is judged that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the levels of light or outlook. In terms of privacy, there are no side window proposed that would face onto these neighbours and the additional rear facing openings would not afford greater views than the current situation that would impinge on their privacy.</p> <p>Overall, subject to conditions in the event of an approval, the proposal would broadly comply with Policies D1 of the District Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance and NPPF in relation to maintaining the living conditions of any neighbours.</p>
<p>Access, car parking and highway considerations</p>	<p>As the proposed extension would increase the number of bedrooms at the property from three to four and involve the loss of the existing garage, it is important that the Council Parking SPG and Interim Parking Standards are considered. Given the location of the application site and the number of bedrooms proposed it is considered that the development should seek to provide three off street car parking spaces in this case.</p> <p>It was noted at the site visit that the front of the property already benefits from a large area of hardstanding at the frontage that allows for the parking of at least three parking spaces. Furthermore, the size of the existing garage falls below the minimum space dimensions set out in Council's Interim Parking Standard and is therefore considered inadequately sized for many modern cars. As such there are no objections raised in terms of parking.</p>
<p>Any other considerations</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Having regard to the above, the proposed extensions, by virtue of their scale, form and design fails to reflect the proportions of, or be subordinate in scale to, the original dwelling. The proposal would therefore result in visually over dominant additions to the dwelling which fails to reflect the design and character of the property and which would be detrimental to the character of the streetscene. Accordingly the proposal represents a poor standard of design that would be contrary to policies D1</p>	

and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework .

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed extensions, by virtue of their scale, form and design fails to reflect the proportions of, or be subordinate in scale to, the original dwelling. The proposal would therefore result in visually over dominant additions to the dwelling which fails to reflect the design and character of the property and which would be detrimental to the character of the streetscene. Accordingly the proposal represents a poor standard of design that would be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework .

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
001		Existing Floor Plans	6 April 2021
002		Existing Elevations & Sections	6 April 2021
21/SPP/000		Proposed Location & Block Plans	6 April 2021
101		Proposed Floor Plans	6 April 2021
102		Proposed Elevations & Sections	6 April 2021
21/SPE/000		Existing Location & Block Plans	6 April 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 William Myers
21 June 2021