

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2022/0758/HOUSE  
**Location:** 49 Mulberry Mead Hatfield AL10 9EH  
**Proposal:** Erection of a single storey side extension to facilitate conversion of garage into a habitable space.  
**Officer:** Ms Kirsty Shirley

**Recommendation:** Refused

6/2022/0758/HOUSE

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>The application site is an end of terrace dwelling leads into a cul-de-sac. The dwelling is located on a corner plot on an open part of the road, resulting in the front, side and rear of the dwelling to be clearly visible from the public realm. Mulberry Mead is a narrow road with no parking restrictions.</p> <p>This application follows previously refused application 6/2021/1405/FULL. Application 6/2021/1405/FULL was refused due to poor quality of design and inadequate parking provision.</p> <p>This application follows previously refused application 6/2021/3353/HOUSE. Application 6/2021/3353/HOUSE was for the erection of a single storey front and side extension, following the conversion of the garage into a utility room and kitchen. Application 6/20221/3353/HOUSE was refused due to poor quality of design and inadequate parking provision.</p> <p>This application (6/2022/0758/HOUSE) seeks to overcome the previous refusal reasons of application 6/2021/3353/HOUSE. Application 6/2022/0758/HOUSE is for the erection of a single storey front and side to rear extension to facilitate conversion of garage into a habitable space.</p>
<b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b>	<p>AAS - Area of Archaeological Significance Area of Archaeological Significance :  AAS12 - Distance: 2.95  GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 27.36  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 Garden Village) - Distance: 0</p>
<b>Relevant planning history</b>	<p>Application Number: 6/2021/0416/PN8  Decision: Prior Approval Not Required  Decision Date: 30 March 2021  Proposal: Prior approval for the erection of a single storey rear extension measuring 6m in depth, 3.00m in height and 2.40m to the eaves</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/1405/FULL  Decision: Refused</p>

	<p>Decision Date: 05 July 2021          Proposal: Erection of two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, front porch, loft conversion with the installation of 1 x front dormer and 1 x rear juliet balcony and alterations to fenestration</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/3336/LAWP          Decision: Granted          Decision Date: 20 January 2022          Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the installation of two front roof lights and rear dormer window</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/3353/HOUSE          Decision: Refused          Decision Date: 28 January 2022          Proposal: Erection of a single storey front and side extension following conversion of garage into a habitable space.</p>		
<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	Neighbour notification letters		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	None received		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	Hatfield Town Council – no response		
<b>Relevant Policies</b>			
<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			
<b>Main Issues</b>			
<b>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</b>	<p>The NPPF places great emphasis upon achieving good quality design. 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 of 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 <i>'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 code'</i></p> <p>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. Policy D1 requires the standard of design in all new development to be of a high quality and Policy D2 requires all new development to respect and relate to the character and context of the area in which it is proposed. It notes that development proposals should as a minimum maintain, and where possible, should enhance or improve 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</p>		

	<p>proposal and how it harmonises with the existing building and area.</p> <p>The proposal is for a partial front extension finishing in line with the existing projecting front elevation to facilitate the creation of a porch. The extension would fit in under the existing mono-pitch roof featured on the dwelling and the size and scale of the extension would appear subservient to the existing dwelling. The front extension would not detract from the character of the dwelling or wider area by virtue of the design, positioning and scale of the development.</p> <p>The proposal also includes extending the existing garage both to the front and rear elevation. The proposed front elevation of the garage would be set back from the front elevation of the property and the rear extension would finish in line with the existing rear elevation. The garage would then be used as a utility room and kitchen.</p> <p>The existing garage features a gabled roof in keeping with the gabled roof of the application dwelling. The proposal would maintain the existing garage roof, with a flat roof projecting from the rear of the current garage roof to serve the proposed rear extension. The flat roof serving the rear extension would be mostly concealed from view due to its positioning. The front extension from the garage would have a minimal projection and would remain served by the existing gable roof of the garage, remaining in keeping with the character of the dwelling and appearing consistent within the street scene.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the design of the development would be acceptable and has overcome previous refusal reason 1 of refused application 6/2021/3353/HOUSE.</p>
<p><b>Impact on neighbours</b></p>	<p>No neighbour representations have been received.</p> <p>It is considered that the positioning, size and scale of the proposed development would not result in adjoining neighbours to experience a detrimental loss of light or privacy, nor would the development appear overbearing or unduly dominant.</p>
<p><b>Access, car parking and highway considerations</b></p>	<p>Policy M14 of the District Plan and the Parking Standards SPG use maximum standards and are not consistent with the NPPF. Nevertheless the Council has adopted an interim Policy for Car Parking and Garage Sizes which identifies the car parking standards set out in the SPG Parking Standards as guidelines rather than maximums. Applications are determined on a case by case basis taking into account of the relevant circumstances of the proposal, its size context and its wider surroundings. The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate through submitted information that the level of car parking is appropriate.</p> <p>The proposal would result in a ground floor study, which could feasibly be used as a bedroom by the current or future occupiers. The proposal would therefore increase the bedrooms within the property from three to four. The proposal would also reduce the size of the front driveway and size of the garage.</p> <p>The application site is within Zone 4 of the Council's Car Parking SPG, which advises a four bedroom dwelling in this location should provide three car parking spaces. Zone 4 is a less accessible site within the Borough. The application site is away from a town centre and is not at a convenient walking</p>

	<p>distance from the nearest train station. Nearby facilities and shops are limited.</p> <p>The application site benefits from a front driveway suitable for parking one vehicle. The driveway measures approximately 6.8m in length and approximately 2.5m in width, suitable to park one vehicle.</p> <p>The Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards and Garage Sizes outlines that many existing domestic garages are too small for their intended purpose for parking/storing vehicles. The Council will seek to ensure that new garages have a genuine ability to be used for their intended purpose and will require them to be at least 6 metres long by 3 metres wide and sufficiently tall to accommodate modern cars. Whilst dimensions of the previous garage fall below the identified size requirements, at approximately 5.2m in length and approximately 2.5m in width, these measurements could reasonably park a vehicle. The proposed garage space would be approximately 1.7m in internal length and approximately 2.4m in internal width, with French doors inserted within the front elevation of the resultant garage. The size, scale and access to the resultant garage would not be suitable to park one vehicle.</p> <p>The application site is located in an area that sees driveways, garages, narrowing of roads and a tight highway geometry, and these features limit the ability to conveniently or safely park on the highway, as well as some parking hampering the safe use of footways. Additional parking on the road is likely to add to parking pressures within the vicinity, and this would be harmful to the convenience and safety of other road users and to pedestrians.</p> <p>Moreover, the proliferation of on-street parking would cause harm to the established residential character of the area, by leading to a cluttered appearance of cars parked in an indiscriminate fashion: the original design of the housing estate was carefully considered to minimise visual intrusion of car parking, with the provision of discrete parking courts, set-back driveways and pedestrian only routes. The under provision of two car parking spaces would therefore be unacceptable in this case.</p> <p>If the proposal were to be permitted then it would set an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult for the Council to resist similar development elsewhere. There is considered to be to be a reasonable prospect of similar development being repeated nearby: the wider estate contains many houses that could be extended in the same way, and if that was to be repeated without parking provision that accords with the planning policies and the guidance in the SPG and the Interim Policy referred to earlier, then the cumulative effect would be harmful to highway safety and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The proposal therefore fails to provide adequate on-site parking to accommodate the proposed development and subsequently fails to overcome previous refusal reason 2 of previous application 6/2021/3353/HOUSE.</p>
<p><b>Any other considerations</b></p>	<p><i>Flood Zone Surface Water 1000</i></p> <p>Part of the application site is located within the above constraint. However due to the small scale of development, it is considered that no further details are required in terms of flood protection of the proposed extension.</p>

**Conclusion**

The proposal fails to provide adequate on-site parking to accommodate the proposed development. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards 2004; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The proposal fails to provide adequate on-site parking to accommodate the proposed development. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards 2004; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

## REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
		Site location plan	29 March 2022
JEP.NOV.2 1F 1/2		Existing and Proposed Floor and block plans and cross sections	29 March 2022
JEP.NOV.2 1F 2/2		Existing and Proposed Elevations	29 March 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  
24 May 2022