

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/2526/HOUSE
Location: 379 St Albans Road West Hatfield AL10 9RU
Proposal: 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.
Officer: Ms Kirsty Shirley

Recommendation: Refused

6/2021/2526/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is located to the south of St Albans Road West and is comprised of a two storey semi-detached dwelling with front driveway and elongated rear garden. 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 been previously extended.</p> <p>The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey front extension, a two storey side extension, a two storey rear extension and insertion of a rear box dormer.</p> <p>This application seeks to overcome the concerns of the previously refused application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE, which sought permission for the erection of 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> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/1107/HOUSE Decision: Refused Decision Date: 21 June 2021 Proposal: 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> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/1106/LAWP Decision: Refused Decision Date: 07 July 2021</p>

	<p>Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of a new outbuilding in the rear garden</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/2074/LAWP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 26 August 2021 Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of an outbuilding</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 4	Other: 0
Publicity	Neighbour notification letter		
Summary of neighbour responses	<p>377 St Albans Road West - Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overbearing, overdevelopment and alters the street scene • Impacts on amenity and privacy. <p>381 St Albans Road West – Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overbearing and impact our privacy • Out of keeping with the area <p>383 St Albans Road West – Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overly dominant and out of keeping with the area • The scale will impact light and privacy • Six bedrooms will lead to parking issues in the area <p>375 St Albans Road West - Object:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive and disproportionate development • Overbearing and out of keeping with the area • Impact our light and privacy • Could become a HMO <p>Comments from the applicant in response to neighbour objections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The street scene is changing • HMOs require licence and would need to be authorised should this property seek to change in future • We are a family with genuine need for this development. 		
Consultees and responses	Hatfield Town Council - Object: Huge extension turns modest 3 bed semi into 6 bed 5 bath house. Previous application refused due to size and poor design, we do not think that anything has changed except that this has a smaller first floor extension to the front which is less bad.		
Relevant Policies			
<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: From Emerging Local Plan 2016 - SP1 Delivering Sustainable Development SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM 11 Amenity and Layout SADM 12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse			

Main Issues	
<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 126 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 130 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 134 is clear that “development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes”.</p> <p>District Plan Policy GBSP2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 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>This application seeks to overcome the previous refusal reason for application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE. Application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE was refused on the basis of the proposals design, scale, form which would result in the proposal to appear visually over dominant towards the application dwelling and would subsequently fail to respect and relate to the character of the street scene.</p> <p>This application is a resubmission of the previously refused scheme, but with amendments. These amendments include a reduced the width of the proposed rear dormer, change in roof form, omission of the first floor front extension and subsequently altering the roof form on the now single storey front extension.</p> <p>The proposed roof form of the dwelling would create an unusual roof which appears gabled at the top and then at a lower level would extend outwards in a hipped form. The street scene is characterised by hipped roofs and the proposed roof form would appear visually unbalanced in its semi-detached pairing as well as detracting and discordant within the wider street scene.</p> <p>The dormer window proposed in application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE did not meet the SDG’s guidance of being set in 1m from the flank elevation, nor was the previous dormer considered to be a subservient addition within the existing roof slope.</p> <p>Due to the proposed roof form in this application, the width of the dormer has been reduced and setback 1m from the boundary of adjoining neighbour No. 377. However, the positioning of the proposed dormer within the roof remains contrary to the SDG’s guidance of being set in 1m from the flank elevation with less than 1m between the dormer cheek and flank elevation. Although the proposed dormer remains set down from the ridge and back from the eaves, given the excessive extent to which the dormer window spans across the roof slope, the dormer window would not be considered a subservient addition</p>

	<p>within the existing roof slope.</p> <p>The proposed single storey front extension's limited height and projection would appear subordinate towards the application dwelling and the crown roof of the front extension would appear in keeping with the characteristic hipped roofs of the area. Single storey front extensions are common within the street scene and it is not considered that the proposed front extension would result in a marked change in the character and appearance of this row of semi-detached properties.</p> <p>The proposed two storey element of the rear extension is still considered to be excessive in scale, as the width of the extension would remain greater than that of the existing two storey part of the dwelling and consequently the rear extension is considered to be excessive in scale and overbearing towards the existing dwelling.</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>It is considered that amendments to the proposal within this application compared to previous application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE would still result in the proposed extensions to overwhelm and dominate the existing dwelling. The proposal would continue to fail to respect the character of the area and subsequently has not overcome previous refusal reason 1.</p> <p>Consequently, it is considered that the proposed development is 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 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 neighbours would be those located to either side of the application site (No. 377 and No. 381 St Albans Road West).</p> <p>Objections have been received from neighbours in regards to loss of light and privacy, and the proposal's overbearing impact.</p> <p>The proposal of the previous application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE was considered too broadly comply with Policy D1 of the District Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance and NPPF in relation to maintaining the living conditions of any neighbours.</p> <p>In this case, reduction in scale of the proposal compared to previous application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE, alongside the removal of one window in the flank elevation of the application dwelling, would ensure that the development would still comply with Policy D1 of the District Plan; the Supplementary</p>

	Design Guidance and NPPF in relation to maintaining the living conditions of any neighbours.
Access, car parking and highway considerations	<p>As the proposed extension would increase the number of bedrooms at the property from three to five 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>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>
Conclusion	
<p>The proposed development does not overcome the previous refusal reason on application 6/2021/1107/HOUSE and the consequently the proposal would 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.</p> <p>Accordingly the proposal represents a poor standard of design that would be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal would result in visually over dominant additions to the dwelling which fails to reflect the design and character of the property, 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; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
21/SPE/000		Existing location and block plans	2 September 2021
21/SPP/000		Proposed location and block plans	2 September 2021
001		Existing floor plans	2 September 2021
002		Existing elevations and sections	2 September 2021

301	Proposed floor plans	2 September 2021
302	Proposed elevations, sections and roof plan	2 September 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
14 October 2021