

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2021/1405/FULL  
**Location:** 49 Mulberry Mead Hatfield AL10 9EH  
**Proposal:** Erection of two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, front porch, loft conversion with the installation of 1 x front dormer and 1 x rear juliet balcony and alterations to fenestration  
**Officer:** Ms Louise Sahlke

**Recommendation:** Refused

6/2021/1405/FULL

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>49 Mulberry Mead is an end of terrace dwelling leads into a cul-de-sac. The dwelling is located on a corner plot on an open part of the road so that the front, side and rear of the dwelling are visible from the public realm. Mulberry Mead is a narrow road with no parking restrictions.</p> <p>The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of two storey rear extension, single storey side extension incorporating conversion of the garage, front porch, loft conversion with the installation of 1 x front dormer and 1 x rear Juliet balcony and alterations to fenestration. The proposal also involves the erection of new fencing and landscaping works.</p> <p>Please note that due to the restrictions in place as a result of the Coronavirus pandemic, no site visit was made to the rear of the site. However, the case officer was satisfied that the application could be assessed using observations from the street, together with the photos and plans submitted by the agent.</p>
<b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b>	<p>AAS - Area of Archaeological Significance Area of Archaeological Significance :  AAS12 - Distance: 1.69  GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 26.98  PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) - Distance: 0  Wards - Hatfield Villages - Distance: 0  A4HD - Article 4 HMO Direction - Distance: 0  FM00 - Flood Zone Surface Water 1000mm (7585125) - Distance: 0  HAT - Hatfield Aerodrome - Distance: 0  HEN - No known habitats present (medium priority for habitat creation) - Distance: 0  SAGB - Sand and Gravel Belt - Distance: 0  HHAA - Hatfield Heritage Assessment Area(Hatfield Garden Village) - Distance: 0</p>
<b>Relevant planning history</b>	<p>Application Number: S6/1999/1115/OP  Decision: Approval Subject to s106  Decision Date: 30 April 2002  Proposal: Residential development (outline) including access to public highway</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2001/1045/DE  Decision: Granted</p>

	<p>Decision Date: 21 May 2002          Proposal: Erection of 111 houses and 20 flats, together with garaging, parking areas, access roads, footways / cycleways and public open space</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/0416/PN8          Decision: Prior Approval Not Required          Decision Date: 30 March 2021          Proposal: Prior approval for the erection of a single storey rear extension measuring 6m in depth, 3.00m in height and 2.40m to the eaves</p>		
<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	Written neighbour notification.		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	None.		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	<p>Hatfield Town Council – No comments received.</p> <p>Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Parking Services – No comments received.</p> <p>Joint Committee of the National Amenity Societies – No comments received.</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council Historic Environment Advisor – No comments received.</p>		
<b>Relevant Policies</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input checked="" 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 R7 Protection of Ground and Surface Water  <u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016</u>  SP4 Transport and Travel SADM2 Highway Network and Safety SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM11 Amenity and Layout SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse SADM14 Flood Risk and Surface Water Management SP11 Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets SADM16 Ecology and Landscape			
<b>Main Issues</b>			
<b>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</b>	<p>49 Mulberry Mead is a two storey end of terrace dwelling within a relatively modern residential estate. The properties are located on small plots and the access has narrow geometry.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to undertake substantial works to create a 4/5 bedroom dwelling. The existing garage would be converted and extended both at the front and rear with the insertion of a rooflight. The proposal seeks to erect a two storey rear extension, and front porch. Finally a loft conversion with front dormer window, rooflights and Juliette Balcony would be constructed.</p>		

A review of Mulberry Mead shows that some extensions have been granted both under permitted development rights and under householder planning applications. However, there are no examples of two storey rear extensions or front dormer windows.

In isolation, some elements of the proposed development would be acceptable. However, the overall proposal would fail to be subordinate in scale or appearance to the host dwelling and associated garage. In particular the two storey rear extension and loft conversion, in regards to its overall scale, height, width, depth, massing and roof design would result in cramped and overly dominant additions.

The resulting development would fail to respect the form and scale of the original dwelling. The architectural detailing of the proposal in regards to its sizeable roof form does not respect the character and appearance of the existing house, neighbouring properties or wider estate which displays a consistent character.

In addition to the above, the proposal also seeks to erect an area of fencing following part demolition of the existing boundary wall. The application describes the fence as being “for access”, however, there are no details of gates, a crossover, a dropped kerb, or hardstanding to facilitate access. The proposed plans show a fence which would match the height of the existing wall.

The erection of a fence is generally not an unacceptable form of development in a residential setting, especially where similar examples of hard boundary treatments are witnessed nearby. However, each proposal must be considered on its merits and whilst existing boundary treatments are a material consideration, there are localised differences in the character, appearance and the function which they serve. In this case it is proposed to demolish an existing curved wall and to erect a replacement fence, which would have the effect of squaring off a corner of the rear garden serving the application dwelling by enclosing an area of soft landscaping which is currently open the street. It is considered that the proposal would represent poor quality design which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is because the existing wall is a positive feature which serves to enhance the character and appearance of the area. Its curved design adds interest, provides space for a street tree and affords visual relief to what would otherwise be a prominent corner when viewed from the street and the properties to the north west of the site. In comparison, the proposed fence would be of a lesser quality in term of materials and its siting would result in the enclosure of soft landscaping which has a public amenity value. In this regard the original design of the housing estate was carefully considered to provide a balance of soft and hard landscaping. Soft landscaping, such as front gardens, grass verges and street trees contribute to the quality of the area. Although the area of soft landscaping affected by the proposal is limited, its enclosure would nevertheless have a deleterious impact on the character and appearance of the area. Overall, by reason of its siting and design, the proposed fence would appear unduly dominant within the streetscene.

Accordingly, the proposal would represent a poor quality of design and would be contrary to provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan 2005, and Supplementary Design Guidance 2005 in this instance.

<p><b>Impact on neighbours</b></p>	<p>The proposed extensions by virtue of their position on the existing dwelling, scale and design would not result in a loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook, overdominance or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties in accordance with planning policy.</p>
<p><b>Access, car parking and highway considerations</b></p>	<p>Policy M14 of the District Plan and the Parking Standards SPG use maximum standards and are not consistent with the NPPF. Nevertheless the Council has adopted an interim Policy for Car Parking and Garage Sizes which identifies the car parking standards set out in the SPG Parking Standards as guidelines rather than maximums. Applications are determined on a case by case basis taking into account of the relevant circumstances of the proposal, its size context and its wider surroundings. The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate through submitted information that the level of car parking is appropriate.</p> <p>The submitted drawings show the extended property to have 4 bedrooms. However, a large study is also proposed which could be optimised in the future without planning permission to be utilised as a 5 bedroom. The proposal also includes the conversion of an existing garage to a laundry room and kitchen.</p> <p>Part of the front driveway would be lost through an extension in front of the existing garage. On measurement of the proposed site plan, one car parking space would be provided.</p> <p>The site lies in 'zone 4', which is a less accessible part of the Borough: the site is away from a town centre and is not at a convenient walking distance from the nearest train station. Nearby facilities and shops are limited. In this instance it is reasonable for the Council to apply the guidelines set out in the SPG.</p> <p>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>Moreover, the proliferation of on-street parking would cause harm to the established residential character of the area, by leading to a cluttered appearance of cars parked in an indiscriminate fashion: the original design of the housing estate was carefully considered to minimise visual intrusion of car parking, with the provision of discrete parking courts, set-back driveways and pedestrian only routes.</p> <p>The proposed development would lead to increased pressure for on-street parking and this would be harmful to highway safety, and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, and to the SPG and Interim Policy.</p> <p>If the proposal were to be permitted then it would set an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult for the Council to resist similar development elsewhere. There is considered to be to be a reasonable prospect of similar development being repeated nearby: the wider estate contains many houses that could be extended in the same way, and if that was to be repeated without</p>

	<p>parking provision that accords with the planning policies and the guidance in the SPG and the Interim Policy referred to earlier, then the cumulative effect would be harmful to highway safety and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Therefore the proposal fails to provide adequate on-site parking to accommodate the proposed development resulting in increased levels of car parking resulting in harm to the safety and operation to the public highway. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005, the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards 2004 and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
<p><b>Any other considerations</b></p>	<p><u>Flood zone surface water 1000</u></p> <p>Part of the application site is located within the above constraint. However due to the small scale of development, it is considered that no further details are required in terms of flood protection of the proposed extension.</p>
<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
<p>The proposal would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity, and the lack of parking would have a detrimental impact on the safety and operation of the public highway contrary to National and Local Planning Policy.</p>	

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The proposal fails to provide adequate on-site parking to accommodate the proposed development. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards 2004; and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal in particularly the two storey rear extension and loft conversion in regards to its overall scale, height, width, depth, massing and architectural detailing would fail to be subordinate in scale or appearance to the original dwelling and associated garage resulting in cramped and overly dominant additions which would fail to respect the form and scale of the original dwelling and associated garage. The architectural detailing of the proposal in regards to its roof form does not respect the character and appearance of the existing house, neighbouring properties or wider estate which is similar in overall character. Accordingly, the proposal would represent a poor quality of design and would be contrary to provisions of the Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan 2005; Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The proposed boundary fence, by reason of its siting and design would appear unduly dominant within the streetscene. Added to this harm would be the enclosure of an area of soft landscaping which would have a deleterious on the visual amenity, character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would represent a poor quality of design and would be contrary to provisions of the Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan 2005; Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

4.

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
49MMH/EX/100		Existing Plans, Section and Elevations	4 May 2021
49MMH/EX/401		Site Plan	4 May 2021
49MMH/PD/401		Proposed Site Plan	4 May 2021
49MMH/PL/100		Proposed Plans	4 May 2021
49MMH/EX/400		Location Plan	4 May 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  
5 July 2021