

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/3553/HOUSE
Location: 2 Barlow Close Hatfield AL10 9GZ
Proposal: Installation of a new sliding gate
Officer: Ms Kirsty Shirley

Recommendation: Granted

6/2021/3553/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is located to the west of Barlow Close within a relatively modern residential estate characterised by a strong degree of consistency in terms of architectural style and materials.</p> <p>The site comprises a detached three storey dwelling with front and rear gardens, a detached rear garage and off street parking. The dwelling is finished in facing brick with a steeply pitched gable roof. The garage is finished in matching brick and, like others in the area, also has a pitched roof. Windows within the application property are of a Georgian style featuring white frames and glazing bars.</p> <p>The application plot is located on the corner of Barlow Close and The Runway so that the front, side and rear of the dwelling are visible from the public realm. Barlow Close and The Runway are private roads with narrow geometry and parking restrictions.</p> <p>This application follows recently refused application 6/2021/2501/HOUSE. Application 6/2021/2501/HOUSE was for the retention of a side extension and a sliding gate, which have been erected without planning approval. Application 6/2021/2501/HOUSE has been appealed by the applicants but a decision regarding the appeal has not been issued as of yet.</p> <p>This application (6/2021/3553/HOUSE) is for the retention of the sliding gate only. As the side extension is existing development, it can be seen in the submitted drawings. Excluding existing development would result in inaccurate drawings. However, the side extension does not form part of the development being assessed in this application, and is being assessed separately under application 6/2021/3554/HOUSE. The recommendation in this report concerns the sliding gate only.</p>
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 27.05 LCA - Landscape Character Area (De Havilland Plain) - Distance: 0 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 Business Park) - Distance: 0</p>

Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/1999/1064/OP Decision: Approval Subject to s106 Decision Date: 29 December 2000 Proposal: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING (UNLISTED) BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF RUNWAY AND OTHER HARD STANDING AREAS AND REDEVELOPMENT FOR THE FOLLOWING PURPOSES: AS A BUSINESS PARK COMPRISING USES WITHIN USE CLASS B1, B2, B8 AND SUI GENERIS USE; HOUSING; NEW UNIVERSITY CAMPUS (USE CLASS D1 AND D2) TO INCLUDE REPLACEMENT DE HAVILLAND SPORTS AND SOCIAL CLUB AND ASSOCIATED PLAYING FIELDS; TWO HOTELS; PRIMARY SCHOOL AND ASSOCIATED FACILITIES; DISTRICT CENTRE; WORKS OF CONVERSION TO ENABLE RECREATION USE OF EXISTING LISTED HANGAR; AVIATION HERITAGE CENTRE. TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY, TRANSPORT AND SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE (INCLUDING A STRATEGIC TRANSPORT CORRIDOR), LANDSCAPING AND OPEN SPACE, DIVERSION OF ELLENBROOK. MEANS OF ACCESS TO BE DETERMINED</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2003/0957/DE Decision: Granted Decision Date: 12 November 2003 Proposal: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 322 DWELLINGS AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE. (WORKS PURSUANT TO OUTLINE APPROVAL S6/1999/1064/OP)</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/2501/HOUSE Decision: Refused Decision Date: 17 November 2021 Proposal: Retention of summer house and sliding gate</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/3554/HOUSE Decision: Not yet determined Decision Date: Unknown Proposal: Retention of erection of single storey side extension</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0
Publicity			
Summary of neighbour responses	75 The Runway – Object: <i>Part of the gate is on my land which has blocked my garden fence.</i>		
Consultees and responses	Hatfield Town Council – no response		
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 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			
Main Issues			
Is the development within a conservation area?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			

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

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable):

Would the development reflect the character of the area?

Yes No

Comment (if applicable): District Plan Policy GBSP2 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 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, 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.

The SDG outlines, amongst other things, that new development should:

- Respond to building forms and patterns of existing buildings in the detailed layout and design to reinforce a sense of place;
- Use local materials and building methods/details to enhance local distinctiveness; and
- Ensure that the scale, height, massing, and space around the new development in relation to the adjoining buildings is considered

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has a stronger emphasis on good quality design than its predecessor. Paragraph 126 clearly advises that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable 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 of the NPPF further advises that decisions should ensure developments will function well and add to the overall character of the area, 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..”*

There have been no amendments to the sliding gate from previously refused application 6/2021/2501/HOUSE and so the assessment remains the same.

The sliding gate is approximately 1.9m in height and is set beneath the existing boundary wall. The height, position and solid design of the sliding gate is acceptable in this instance as it is similar to the boundary wall and would enclose only a short driveway and garage. However, the sliding gate features composite plastic cladding which is discordant with the materials which characterise the area. While fencing is noted within the street scene, the fencing is more traditional in appearance, colour and texture. Although the gate is unacceptable in its current form, an alternative colour / finish which is more in keeping with fences and other built form in the area could be secured by condition.

Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): See above

Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining occupiers? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): An objection has been received from adjoining neighbour No. 75 The Runway. No. 75 has stated that the electric gate has been installed on their land and is blocking the fence that depicts the boundary line between No. 75 and the application site. Land ownership is a separate matter to the planning system and therefore not a material consideration in this application. Due to the nature of the proposal, it is not considered that there would be an undue detrimental impact on neighbour amenity.

Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): The application site benefits from a driveway and garage suitable for two vehicles respectively. Given the nature of the road and traffic movements in the area, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

Subject to the suggested condition, the sliding gate is considered to be in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions:

1. Within 6 months of the date of this permission, samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the sliding gate hereby granted must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, then implemented using the approved materials. Subsequently, the approved materials shall not be changed.

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.

DRAWING NUMBERS

2. 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
mp.277745		Existing elevations	30 December 2021
mp.277454		Proposed elevations	2 February 2022
mp.2534		Proposed Plans	3 February 2022
mma.477		Site plan	3 February 2022
		Location plan	3 February 2022

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

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
31 March 2022