

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2022/0697/HOUSE  
**Location:** Coverack 50 The Ridgeway Cuffley Potters Bar Hertfordshire  
 EN6 4BA  
**Proposal:** Erection of front extension  
**Officer:** Ms Elizabeth Mugova

**Recommendation:** Granted

6/2022/0697/HOUSE

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>The site comprises of a two storey detached dwellinghouse located to the north of The Ridgeway. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The properties in this section of The Ridgeway comprises of detached dwellings that vary in design, size and siting set in very large, deep plots.</p> <p>Planning permission is sought for a single storey front extension measuring approximately 5.7m in width and a depth of approximately 2.5m.</p>
<b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b>	<p>GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0          LCA - Landscape Character Area (Northaw Great Wood) - Distance: 0          LCA - Landscape Character Area (Northaw Common Parkland) - Distance: 0          PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 0          Wards - Northaw &amp; Cuffley - Distance: 0          A4D - ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - Distance: 0          WILD - Home Wood (Cuffley) - Distance: 0</p>
<b>Relevant planning history</b>	<p>Application Number: 6/2022/1099/LAWP          Decision: Awaiting decision          Decision Date:          Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of a single storey side extension</p> <p>Application Number: E6/1956/0913/          Decision: Granted          Decision Date: 24 September 1956          Proposal: Site for one detached house.</p> <p>Application Number: E6/1959/0297/          Decision: Granted          Decision Date: 23 April 1959          Proposal: Erection of chalet bungalow and garage.          Proposal: Site for dwelling house</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2002/0059/FP          Decision: Granted          Decision Date: 20 February 2002          Proposal: Two storey side extension with front dormer windows (re-submission following S6/2000/1481/FP)</p>

	<p>Application Number: S6/2004/1427/FP  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 08 February 2005  Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension, new boundary gates with entrance and exit.</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2016/0025/HOUSE  Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 08 September 2016  Proposal: Erection of single and two storey front, side and rear extensions</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/0637/PN8  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 26 April 2022  Proposal: Prior approval for an 8m rear extension from the kitchen and dining room to form a family room measuring 8 metres in depth and 3 metres to the eaves</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/0322/HOUSE  Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 03 May 2022  Proposal: Erection of single and two storey front, side and rear extensions</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/0583/LAWP  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 06 May 2022  Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for two single storey side extensions</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/0854/PN27  Decision: Prior Approval Required and Granted  Decision Date: 01 June 2022  Proposal: Prior approval for the construction of an additional storey to facilitate the enlargement of the dwellinghouse to a maximum of approximately 10m in height</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/1041/PN8  Decision: Prior Approval Not Required  Decision Date: 06 June 2022  Proposal: Prior approval for 8m deep single storey rear extension to the width of the original dwelling</p>		
<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	Site Notice Display Date: 6 April 2022 Site Notice Expiry Date: 29 April 2022 Neighbour letters		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	No representations received		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	No representations received		

**Relevant Policies**

NPPF  
 D1  D2  GBSP1  GBSP2  M14  
 Supplementary Design Guidance  Supplementary Parking Guidance  Interim Policy for car parking and garage sizes

Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016  
SADM34 Development within the Green Belt

**Main Issues****Is the development within a conservation area?**

Yes  No

**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  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable):**Green Belt**Appropriateness

The National Planning Policy Framework (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.

District Plan Policy RA3 (Extension to Dwellings in the Green Belt) defines the criteria that must be complied with in order for planning permission to be granted. The policy advises that extensions would not individually or when considered with existing or approved extensions to the original dwelling, result in a disproportionate increase in the size of the original dwelling. A further requirement is that proposed development should not have an adverse visual impact (bulk, design, size and prominence) on the surrounding area.

On the other hand, Emerging Local Plan Policy SADM34 states that applicants 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. The policy further goes on to state that account will be taken of the extent to which the extension would be consistent with the general pattern of development and character of the area and its prominence within the landscape.

For the purpose of this application, a comparison must be made with the original building as it existed in 1948.

Neither the District Plan nor NPPF provide any detailed guidance on how to determine whether an extension is disproportionate. This is, therefore, ultimately a planning judgement of fact and degree, which demands that each proposal is considered in relation to the size and appearance of the original building. The proposed increase in volume, footprint and floorspace are commonly used indicators, however, as well as mathematical calculations, the visual impact of the extension has to be considered.

The existing building is as originally built. However, a recent application approved in May 2022 under 6/2022/0322/HOUSE for erection of single and two storey front, side and rear extensions which would increase floor area by approximately 70% has not yet been implemented. The original

dwelling has a floor area of approximately 221.52 m<sup>2</sup>. The proposed front extension would have a floor area of about 14.45 m<sup>2</sup>; increasing the floor area of the original building by approximately 6.5%. Therefore, the approximate 14.45sqm addition to the application dwelling, together with the extant permission would result in a cumulative 76.5% increase above the original dwelling. Although the proposed extension would only result in a floor area of approximately 14.45m<sup>2</sup> over the existing dwelling, if permission 6/2022/0322/HOUSE were to be implemented the proposal would be significant in spatial terms.

Considerable weight is given to emerging Policy SADM34 which states that account should be taken of the extent to which the extension would be consistent with the character of the area. The Ridgeway consists of large detached dwellings which vary in design and size. The application property is smaller in size compared to other properties within the streetscene. In addition, the proposal would not protrude forward of the existing projection. Whilst the proposal would be prominent from public vantage points and the building would appear larger, given the single storey nature of the proposal and its limited scale, it would not appear disproportionate when compared to the original building, taking into account the cumulative impacts of the extant permission. Therefore, whilst being at the very limit of what would be considered acceptable, the proposal would not be inappropriate development and would not conflict with District Plan Policy RA3, Emerging Local Plan Policy SADM34 or the Framework in this regard.

Accordingly, the extension would represent appropriate development in the Green Belt. The Courts have held that appropriate development in the Green Belt is not harmful to Green Belt openness or the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

**Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?**

Yes  No  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable): In terms of character and appearance, the scale of the single storey extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposed external materials would match the existing house. Subject to a planning condition regarding matching materials, it is considered that the proposal would accord with local and national policies.

Overall, the proposal would not result in harm to the property or the surrounding area.

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

Yes  No  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable): The proposed front extension would not cause harm to neighbours' living conditions due to its siting, scale and nature.

**Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?**

Yes  No  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable):

**Conclusion**

Subject to a planning condition regarding matching materials, it is considered that the proposed development would be in accordance with local and national policies.

**Conditions:**

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

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory standard of development in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and

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:

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
1569_300		Site Location Plan	24 March 2022
1569_310		Existing Floor Plans & Elevations	24 March 2022
1569_301		Existing Block Plan	24 March 2022
1569_322		Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations	24 March 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 paragraphs 186-187 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).

### **Informatives:**

1. This permission does not convey any consent which may be required under any legislation other than the Town and Country Planning Acts. Any permission required under the Building Regulations or under any other Act, must be obtained from the relevant authority or body e.g. Fire Officer, Health and Safety Executive, Environment Agency (Water interest etc. Neither does this permission negate or override any private covenants which may affect the land.
2. 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](mailto: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](http://www.hertfordshirebc.co.uk)

**Determined By:**

Mr Mark Peacock  
13 June 2022