

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2022/0893/HOUSE

Location: 1 Stonecross Road Hatfield AL10 0HR

Proposal: Erection of a single storey, part two storey rear extension

Officer: Ms Kirsty Shirley

Recommendation: Refused

6/2022/0893/HOUSE

| 6/2022/0893/HOUSI | | | | | |
|---|--|-----------|----------|--|--|
| Context | | | | | |
| Site and Application description | The application site is a corner plot located on the junction of Stonecross Road and Ground Lane. The application dwelling is an end of terrace dwelling located on the north side of Stonecross Road, with the flank elevation of the dwelling facing towards Ground Lane. The curvature and elevational height of Stonecross Road allows for views of rear roofslopes and elevations of dwellings located on the north side of Stonecross Road to be mostly visible from vantage points from Ground Lane. | | | | |
| Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005) | PAR - PARISH (HATFIELD) - Distance: 0 ROW - FOOTPATH (HATFIELD 013) - Distance: 34.53 Wards - Hatfield East - Distance: 0 A4HD - Article 4 HMO Direction - Distance: 0 HHAA - Hatfield Heritage Assessment Area(Hatfield New Town) - Distance: 0 | | | | |
| Relevant planning history | Application Number: S6/2013/1967/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 04 November 2013 Proposal: Erection of garage to rear of property Application Number: 6/2019/2744/HOUSE Decision: Granted Decision Date: 10 January 2020 Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension and part side part rear single storey rear extension with internal alterations. Application Number: 6/2022/0247/VAR Decision: Granted Decision Date: 31 March 2022 Proposal: Variation of condition 2 (development must be completed in accordance with approved plans) on planning permission 6/2019/2744/HOUSE | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | |
| Neighbour representations | Support: 0 | Object: 0 | Other: 0 | | |
| Publicity | Neighbour notification letter | | | | |

| Summary of | None received | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| neighbour | | | | | |
| responses | | | | | |
| Consultees and | Hatfield Town Council – no response | | | | |
| responses | The Ramblers' Association – no response | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Relevant Policies | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| □ D1 □ GBSP1 □ GBSP2 □ M14 | | | | | |
| Supplementary Design Guidance □ Supplementary Parking Guidance □ Interim | | | | | |
| Policy for car parking and garage sizes | | | | | |
| Others | | | | | |
| Main Issues | | | | | |
| Design (form, | The NPPF places great emphasis upon achieving good quality design. | | | | |
| size, scale, siting) | Paragraph 126 advises that the creation of high quality buildings and places is | | | | |
| and Character | fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve | | | | |
| (appearance | and that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Paragraph | | | | |
| within the | 130 of the NPPF further advises that decisions should ensure developments | | | | |
| streetscene) | will function well, 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 | | | | |

design guides and code'

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 proposal and how it harmonises with the existing building and area.

any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey, part two storey rear extension. The single storey rear extension would extend across most of the width of the application dwelling with the part first floor rear extension extending over halfway across the width of the rear elevation. The extension would project approximately 3m from the rear elevation. The first floor extension would feature a gable roof with part of the single storey extension featuring a flat roof.

Due the size, scale and concentration of development to the rear of the property, the bulk and massing of the proposal would appear overbearing towards the application dwelling. The proposed extension would represent a substantial addition to the rear of the dwelling, with the bulk and massing of the extension clearly visible from the street scene due to the corner plot of the application site, the end of terrace nature of the dwelling and the positioning of the first floor development on the application dwelling. Furthermore, the ridge of proposed gable roof of the extension would project approximately 4.5m at a point of the gable roof of the current dwelling which measures approximately 4.3m in depth. This disparity in size further emphasises the proposed

developments bulk and massing. The eaves to the left side of the proposed gable roof when viewing the dwelling from the rear would also extend beyond the existing eaves of the dwelling. The existing eaves project outwards from the front and rear elevations of the dwelling in a form that this is replicated at each end of terrace dwelling in the four blocks of dwellings located to the north side of Stonecross Road. The proposal would therefore interrupt this uniformity in the eaves and would consequently detrimentally detract from the character of both the application dwelling and wider area.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would represent a poor standard of design, contrary to 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.

No windows would be inserted into the first floor side elevations of the extension, protecting the privacy of the occupiers of No.2 Stonecross Road. A ground floor window would be inserted into the side elevation facing Ground lane and two windows would be inserted into the first floor rear elevation. No dwellings adjoin the application site to the rear or flank elevation and so these windows would not result in any harmful overlooking.

The properties to the north side of Stonecross road have rear gardens that face north east, experiencing sunlight from the mid-afternoon onwards. The position and scale of the dwelling would not result in adjoining neighbour No. 2 Stonecross Road to experience a detrimental loss of sunlight. Similarly, the positioning, size and scale of the dwelling would not appear overbearing or unduly dominant towards the adjoining neighbours of No. 2 Stonecross Road.

Access, car parking and highway considerations

The proposal would not increase the amount of bedrooms within the dwelling and so parking is not a consideration for this application.

Conclusion

By virtue of the size, scale, positioning and design of the proposal, the proposed development would represent a poor standard of design, contrary to District Plan Policies D1 and D2; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reasons for Refusal:

 By virtue of the size, scale, positioning and design of the proposal, the proposed development would represent a poor standard of design, contrary to District Plan Policies D1 and D2; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

| Plan Number | Revision Number | Details | Received Date |
|----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|
| HET 1682/04 | | Location Plan and proposed elevations | 13 April 2022 |
| HET 1682 03 | | Floor plans and existing elevations | 13 April 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 Derek Lawrence 30 May 2022