

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/3198/HOUSE
Location: 55 The Ridgeway Cuffley Potters Bar EN6 4BD
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, alterations to fenestrations and existing balcony above extension
Officer: Ms Kirsty Shirley

Recommendation: Granted

6/2021/3198/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is located to the south of the Ridgeway and is comprised of a detached two storey dwelling with front driveway and sizeable rear garden.</p> <p>The application is for the erection of a single storey rear extension with rooftop balcony and alterations to fenestration. During the course of this application, the rooftop balcony was reduced in size with obscured side glazing introduced.</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: 17.02 PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 17.02 Wards - Northaw & Cuffley - Distance: 0 A4D - ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - Distance: 17.02</p>
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: E6/1963/0447/ Decision: Granted Decision Date: 18 February 1964 Proposal: Detached house and garage.</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1976/0087/ Decision: Refused Decision Date: 08 April 1976 Proposal: Two storey front extension including new garage</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1992/0722/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 11 January 1993 Proposal: Two storey front and single storey side extensions and formation of pitched roof over existing flat roof to side</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1994/0116/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 14 April 1994 Proposal: Alterations to roof to incorporate new front and rear dormers, and alterations to side elevation incorporating new dormer window to side elevation</p>

	Application Number: S6/1995/0492/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 01 September 1995 Proposal: Erection of front extension to existing garage		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Publicity	Site Notice Display Date: 7 January 2022 Site Notice Expiry Date: 28 January 2022 Neighbour notification letter		
Summary of neighbour responses	None received		
Consultees and responses	Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council – Object: <i>the pitched roof is suggested to be removed which therefore means the balcony would look over into neighbouring properties</i> Herts & Middlesex Bat Group – no response Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust – no response Hertfordshire Ecology – no response		
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: RA3, SADM34			
Main Issues			
Green Belt			
<p>The application site is washed over by the Metropolitan Green Belt as defined by Local Plan Policy GBSP1. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), states, in paragraph 147 that, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 then states that substantial weight should be given to any harm in the Green Belt and that “very special circumstances” will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>The NPPF, in paragraph 149, 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. Exception (c) is engaged in this case and explains that the extension or alteration to a building is not inappropriate provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The NPPF defines the “original building” as a building as it existed in July 1948 or, if constructed after that date, as it was originally built.</p> <p>District Plan Policy RA3, like the NPPF, allows for extensions in the Green Belt which would not result in a disproportionate increase in the size of the dwelling, either individually or when considered with existing or approved extensions to the original dwelling. Policy RA3 states that extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt will only be permitted where they would not have an adverse visual impact (in terms of its prominence, size, bulk and design) on the character, appearance and pattern</p>			

of development of the surrounding countryside. Additionally it is noted in emerging Policy SADM34 that the applicant will need to demonstrate that extensions and alterations to a building would not result, either individually or cumulatively, in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building in terms of bulk, scale, height or massing. Each proposal is therefore considered in relation to the size and character of the original building and the impact of the proposed extension on these factors.

The dwelling has been extended before. The planning history shows that the footprint of the original dwelling was approximately 113m² and the existing footprint of the dwelling is approximately 159m². The proposal would increase the footprint of the dwelling to approximately 169m², representing an approximate increase in footprint of 49% from the original footprint. While this is a considerable increase in footprint, the dwelling has not been extended beyond what could reasonably be considered proportionate in numerical terms.

In terms of a qualitative assessment, the proposal would be positioned to the rear of the dwelling and would be a subservient addition to the application dwelling. The proposed extension would be unobtrusive, sitting comfortably at the rear of the application dwelling, neither dominating nor fundamentally altering the dwelling's character or appearance. Within the context of the size of the existing dwelling and its surroundings, the extension is subordinate and sympathetic to the design and scale of the existing dwelling.

Taking account of the above, it is considered that in regards to both its size and relationship with the application dwelling, the proposal would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The proposal would therefore represent appropriate development in the Green Belt. The Courts have held that appropriate development is not harmful to Green Belt openness or the purposes of including land within it.

Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be preserved or enhanced?

Yes No

Comment (if applicable):

Would the development reflect the character of the area?

Yes No

Comment (if applicable): Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan, as well as the Supplementary Design Guidance emphasise the importance of good quality design in keeping with the character and context of the area. The National Planning Policy Framework emphasises the importance of good design in context and, in particular, Paragraph 134 states permission 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.

The positioning, size and scale of the proposed extension would ensure that the development would be subservient to the application dwelling and would not be readily visible from the street scene. The extension would feature a flat roof, and part of the roof of the extension would be used as a balcony, accessible from the first floor rear bedroom. The use of the roof as a balcony would not detract from the character of the dwelling and would be of such a size to not appear unduly dominant and discordant with the character and appearance of the application dwelling.

The proposal also includes alterations to the fenestration with the size, style and colour remaining the same as existing. The front door and rear bifolding doors would be finished in grey/black and it is considered that this colour palette would not fundamentally alter the character of the application dwelling or detract from the character of the area. However, the matching materials for the external decorations of the extension can be secured by condition to ensure that the development remains in keeping with the character of the dwelling.

<p>Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Comment (if applicable): See above</p>
<p>Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Comment (if applicable): No neighbour representations have been received.</p> <p>The extension would feature a balcony on the rooftop constructed of glazed balustrading. The glazing facing towards the rear garden would be approximately 1.1m in height and clear to allow for unobstructed views of the rear garden and open greenery beyond. The glazing facing towards adjoining neighbour No. 57 would be approximately 1.7m in height and obscured glazed to protect the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers. This obscured glazing can be secured by condition. The balcony would not project further than the existing rear elevation, which obscures the balcony from view of No. 53, protecting the occupiers' privacy at this address.</p> <p>The positioning, size and scale of the proposed development would not result in either adjoining neighbour to experience a detrimental loss of sunlight, nor would the development appear overbearing or unduly dominant.</p>
<p>Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Comment (if applicable): The proposal does not increase the amount of bedrooms within the dwelling and so parking is not a consideration for this application.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>The proposal is considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan; Emerging Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Subject to the suggested condition, it is considered that the scale and setting of the proposed development would maintain the amenity of adjoining neighbours as well as the appearance of the dwelling and the character of the area, in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>

Conditions:

1. The brickwork, roof tile, bond, mortar, detailing, guttering, soffits and other external decorations of the approved extension must match the existing dwelling in relation to colour and texture.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The first floor glazing panel of the balcony facing towards 57 The Ridgeway must be obscure-glazed and shall be retained in that form thereafter.

REASON: To protect the residential amenity and living conditions of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

DRAWING NUMBERS

3. The development/works shall not be started and completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details:

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
NOV2021_55 TRW_01		Block Plan	30 November 2021
FEB2022_55 TRW_03	A	Proposed Plans & Elevations	17 February 2022
FEB2022_55 TRW_02		Location Plan	17 February 2022
FEB2022_55 TRW_01		Existing Plans & Elevations	17 February 2022

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details.

Informatives:

1. The granting of this permission does not convey or imply any consent to build upon or access from any land not within the ownership of the applicant.
2. Any damage to the grass verges caused by the development/works hereby approved is the responsibility of the applicant and must be re-instated to their original condition, within one month of the completion of the development/works. If damage to the verges are not repaired then the Council and/or Highway Authority will take appropriate enforcement action to remedy any harm caused.
3. In addition, and separate to your planning permission, for the majority of schemes, you are required by law to appoint a building regulator who will inspect your property at various stages during the course of your building project. This is to ensure it is compliant with the Building Regulations and the Building Act 1984.

The checks the building regulator will carry out include, but are not limited to, the structure, foundations, fire precautions and escape routes, electrical and plumbing compliance and other issues such as drainage and insulation. The objective of these checks is to ensure that your building is safe to live in, accessible and environmentally sustainable.

Once all build stages are checked and the works are finished, a Completion Certificate is issued confirming that these objectives have been met. You will also need the Completion Certificate, should you sell the property, as it will confirm to future owners that the work has been carried out in compliance with the Regulations.

As the owner of the property, you are responsible for Building Regulations compliance so we would urge you to decide which regulator to use, as opposed to leaving your builder or architect to make the choice. This is so that you can be sure the building regulator is truly independent and working to protect you from any

breach or omission during the works.

Hertfordshire Building Control Limited are a Company wholly owned by eight local authorities in Hertfordshire including Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council. Please contact them on 01438 879990 or at buildingcontrol@hertfordshirebc.co.uk to discuss the process and all that is involved. Or alternatively refer to the Homeowner Information section on their website at www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk

Determined By:

Mr Mark Peacock
25 February 2022