

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/3554/HOUSE
Location: 2 Barlow Close Hatfield AL10 9GZ
Proposal: Erection of single storey side extension
Officer: Ms Kirsty Shirley

Recommendation: Refused

6/2021/3554/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 (6/2021/3554/HOUSE) is for the retention of the single storey side extension only. As the sliding gate is existing development, it can be seen in the submitted drawings. Excluding existing development would result in inaccurate drawings. However, the sliding gate does not form part of the development being assessed in this application, and is being assessed separately under application 6/2021/3553/HOUSE. The recommendation in this report concerns the single storey side extension 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: 6/2021/3553/HOUSE Decision: Not yet determined Decision Date: Unknown Proposal: Retention of erection of sliding gate</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Publicity	Neighbour notification letter		
Summary of neighbour responses	None received		
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			
Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character	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		

(appearance within the streetscene)

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..”*

The extension is situated between the flank elevation of the dwelling and the existing boundary wall which faces The Runway. The roof of the extension is flat and protrudes approximately 1.1m above the existing boundary wall, with two horizontal windows facing north within the protruding elevation and a rooflight. The extension is finished externally in composite plastic cladding which is grey in colour. The window frames are dark grey / black.

There have been no amendments to the side extension from previously refused application 6/2021/2501/HOUSE and consequently the assessment of the existing side extension remains the same as discussed in application 6/2021/2501/HOUSE.

A considerable portion of the extension remains visible from the street scene and prominent in views from The Runway, with part of the side extension obscured from view due to the existing boundary wall. The architectural detailing of the extension, particularly in regards to its roof form and fenestration, continues to fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the flat roof of the extension remains incongruous with the prevalent pitched roofs of the application dwelling and wider area. The horizontal windows remain at odds with the Georgian style of the existing house and neighbouring properties. The prominent position of the extension within the street scene detracts from the character of the area and is noticeably discordant.

It therefore remains that the extension is not acceptable in terms of its design

	and appearance and continues to be unacceptably discordant with the character of the dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, the development remains contrary with District Plan Policies D1 and D2; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.
Impact on neighbours	No neighbour representations have been received. As there has been no alterations to the side extension from the previous refusal 6/2021/2501/HOUSE, the assessment into neighbouring amenity remains the same, in which the positioning, size and scale of the extension was considered not to result in adjoining neighbours to experience a detrimental loss of sunlight or privacy, nor would the extension appear overbearing or unduly dominant.
Access, car parking and highway considerations	The proposal does not increase the amount of bedrooms within the site and so parking is not a consideration for this application. The application site benefits from a driveway and garage suitable for two vehicles respectively. Hertfordshire Highways Authority had previously commented on application 6/2021/2501/HOUSE that a minimum of 5.5m from the back edge of the carriageway into the site is required for sliding gated entry to allow for vehicles to wait for gates to open clear of the highway. However in this case, as Barlow Close is a privately maintained road this 5.5m requirement is not applicable
Conclusion	
The development is not acceptable in terms of its design and appearance and the development is unacceptably discordant with the character of the dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, the development is contrary with District Plan Policies D1 and D2; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed side extension, by virtue of its siting, height, roof form, fenestration and materials, fails to complement and reflect the design and appearance of the application dwelling and is discordant with the area's character. Consequently, the proposed development represents a poor standard of design which is harmful to the appearance of the application dwelling and the character of the area, contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan; the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
mp.277745		Existing elevations	30 December 2021
mp.234		Existing Floor Plan	30 December 2021
mp.277454		Proposed elevations	30 December 2021
mma.477		Block plan	2 February 2022

mp.2534

Proposed Floor Plan

2 February 2022

Location plan

3 February 2022

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