

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2022/1508/HOUSE
Location: The Lodge 2 Northaw Place Coopers Lane Northaw Potters Bar
 Hertfordshire EN6 4NQ
Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension
Officer: Ms Kirsty Shirley

Recommendation: Refused

6/2022/1508/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	The application site is located to the west of Coopers Lane and is comprised of a two storey detached dwelling with detached garage, sizeable driveway and extensive garden. The site lies entirely within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	AAS - Area of Archaeological Significance Area of Archaeological Significance : AAS43 - Distance: 0 GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0 LCA - Landscape Character Area (Northaw Common Parkland) - Distance: 0 PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 0 Wards - Northaw & Cuffley - Distance: 0 A4D - ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - Distance: 0 HPGU - Northaw Place Gardens - Distance: 0 HPGU - Northaw Place - Distance: 0
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/1982/0021/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 18 February 1982 Proposal: Two storey extensions</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1982/0020/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 18 February 1982 Proposal: Two storey extensions and detached garage</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1997/0909/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 15 December 1997 Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension and first floor rear extension</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1997/0910/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 15 December 1997 Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension and first floor rear extension</p> <p>Application Number: S6/1998/0859/FP Decision: Granted</p>

Decision Date: 30 November 1998
Proposal: Erection of a rear conservatory

Application Number: S6/1998/0937/LB
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 30 November 1998
Proposal: Erection of a rear conservatory, two storey side extension and first floor rear extension

Application Number: S6/1999/0097/FP
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 15 March 1999
Proposal: Erection of wooden trellis fence, a maximum of 1.5 metres in height

Application Number: S6/2000/0788/FP
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 30 October 2000
Proposal: SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO HOUSE AND GARAGE TO FORM ANNEXE FOR DEPENDANT RELATIVE

Application Number: S6/2000/0789/LB
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 30 October 2000
Proposal: SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO HOUSE AND GARAGE TO FORM ANNEXE FOR DEPENDANT RELATIVE

Application Number: S6/2001/0909/FP
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 28 September 2001
Proposal: ERECTION OF PART TWO STOREY, PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

Application Number: S6/2001/0910/LB
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 28 September 2001
Proposal: ERECTION OF PART TWO STOREY, PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

Application Number: S6/2006/1564/FP
Decision: Refused
Decision Date: 15 January 2007
Proposal: ERECTION OF REAR TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE

Application Number: S6/2006/1565/LB
Decision: Refused
Decision Date: 15 January 2007
Proposal: ERECTION OF REAR TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE

Application Number: S6/2007/0546/FP
Decision: Granted
Decision Date: 29 May 2007
Proposal: ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, CREATION OF LIGHTWELL ON FIRST FLOOR, CREATION OF DOUBLE DOORS TO

	<p>EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS.</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2007/0549/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 29 May 2007 Proposal: ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, CREATION OF LIGHTWELL ON FIRST FLOOR, CREATION OF DOUBLE DOORS TO EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS.</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2007/0554/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 29 May 2007 Proposal: INSERTION OF A ROOFLIGHT TO THE ENTRANCE LOBBY.</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2014/0442/LUP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 30 April 2014 Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the proposed conversion of garage to habitable accommodation</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2014/0753/LUP Decision: Refused Decision Date: 30 May 2014 Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of a detached outbuilding</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2014/0980/LB Decision: Granted Decision Date: 30 June 2014 Proposal: Conversion of garage to habitable accommodation, including removing garage door, reducing the opening and installing a window to match existing</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2014/1353/FP Decision: Refused Decision Date: 20 August 2014 Proposal: Erection of detached garage</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2016/0153/HOUSE Decision: Granted Decision Date: 01 April 2016 Proposal: Replacement of existing timber fence along Coopers Lane with new timber acoustic fence</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0
Publicity	<p>Site Notice Display Date: 20 July 2022 Site Notice Expiry Date: 10 August 2022 Neighbour notification letter</p>		
Summary of neighbour responses	<p>1 Northaw Place – Object: <i>the proposed changes to the building contextually change the way in which the building overlooks us and reads relative to the main Northaw Place house. The proposed extension adds two very large bedroom windows which change our privacy setting, and actually makes the building read dominantly from that side. These windows have limited</i></p>		

	<i>opportunity for screening due to the way the driveway is located in the lodge.</i>
Consultees and responses	<p>The Gardens Trust - Alison Allighan – Comment: <i>This property lies within the Locally Listed Northaw Place historic parkland and is part of the setting for the Grade II* listed mansion, with views east/west across the parkland between the two properties. The proposed additions should be adequately screened from these views with the existing trees and shrubs but could be augmented if required.</i></p> <p>HCC Historic Environment Advisor – no response Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council – no response</p>
Relevant Policies	
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NPPF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> D2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GBSP1 <input 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</p> <p><i>Others:</i></p> <p>RA3</p> <p><i>Emerging Local Plan Policies:</i></p> <p>SADM11 SADM34 SP9</p>	
Main Issues	
Green Belt	<p>The application site is washed over by the Metropolitan Green Belt as defined by Local Plan Policy GBSP1. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), states, in paragraph 147 that, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 148 then states that substantial weight should be given to any harm in the Green Belt and that “very special circumstances” will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p><i>Appropriateness</i></p> <p>The 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. The NPPF defines the “original building” as a building as it existed in July 1948 or, if constructed after that date, as it was originally built.</p> <p>District Plan Policy RA3, like the NPPF, allows for extensions in the Green Belt which would not result in a disproportionate increase in the size of the dwelling, either individually or when considered with existing or approved</p>

extensions to the original dwelling. Policy RA3 states that extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt will only be permitted where they would not have an adverse visual impact (in terms of its prominence, size, bulk and design) on the character, appearance and pattern of development of the surrounding countryside. Additionally it is noted in emerging Policy SADM34 that the applicant 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. Each proposal is therefore considered in relation to the size and character of the original building and the impact of the proposed extension on these factors.

The application site has been extended and altered over many years. The Local Planning Authority considers that the floor space of the original property was approximately 198m². Additions to the property have resulted in a considerable increase in the overall floorspace of the dwelling so that it is now in excess of 300m², resulting in a floor area that has been increased by over 65% when compared to that of the original building. This application is for the erection of a two storey side extension, which would add approximately 16.5m² to the footprint of the dwelling and approximately 57.8m² in first floor floorspace. As already stated, the current dwelling is already in excess of 65% larger than the original, and so any further increase in floor space on the site will increase this percentage further. The proposed floor area as a result of the development would be approximately 443m², representing an increase of approximately 123.7% from the original floor space, which excludes other development within the site such as the detached garage. Having regard to all of the above, it is considered that the proposal would amount to a disproportionate increase to the size of the existing dwelling.

In terms of a qualitative assessment, the proposed extension would result in substantial bulk and massing to the existing dwelling, predominantly at first floor level.

It is considered that the proposed extension would be substantial in comparison to the original building as to be disproportionate. The proposal therefore represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The NPPF confirms that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt.

Openness

The NPPF identifies the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. There is no definition of openness in the NPPF but, in the context of the Green Belt, it is generally held to refer to freedom from, or the absence of, development. However, assessing the impact of a proposal on the openness of the Green Belt requires a judgment based on the circumstances of the case.

Openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects - in other words, the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant. The specific characteristics of the proposal and its setting are also relevant in this case when making an assessment.

The application dwelling is setback from the Coopers Lane and is mostly screened by fencing and vegetation. The development would demonstrably

	<p>increase the size of the dwelling, notably at first floor level. The development would introduce built form in an area which currently provides open space, resulting in a material loss of Green Belt openness in spatial terms.</p>
<p>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</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. 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.</p> <p>In terms of the character of the area, paragraph 2.4 of the SDG outlines, amongst other things, that new development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 <p>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 <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..”</i></p> <p>The first floor extension would continue from the ridge height of the dwelling and would extend across, and over, the current single storey element of the dwelling, adding additional footprint to the ground floor of the dwelling. The extension would feature a gable roof in keeping with the roof form it would extend from, as well as featuring dormer windows that would match the existing dormers within the roof of the dwelling.</p> <p>The size and scale of the proposed extension would be a substantial increase to the existing dwelling. The increase in size would be particularly noticeable given the additional bulk and massing would be at first floor level. While the dwelling is mostly screened from view of the street scene, by virtue of fencing and vegetation, partial views of the development would be visible from the street scene due to the scale and positioning of the extension, detracting from the character of the area.</p>

	<p>It is therefore considered that the proposed development, by virtue of the extensions positioning, size and scale, would result in unduly dominant and overbearing additions to the dwelling that would fail to complement and reflect the design and appearance of the application dwelling. Accordingly, 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; Policies SP9 and SADM11 of the Emerging Local Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>One objection has been received from No. 1 Northaw Place with concerns regarding the scale of development and privacy. Concerns regarding the scale of the development have been addressed earlier in the report.</p> <p>In regards to privacy, the nearest property to the application site is located on the other side of Coopers Lane, approximately 20m from the application site. No. 1 Northaw Place is located approximately 95m from the application site. The application site also benefits from vegetative screening, and in combination with substantial distances between the nearest properties, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in a loss of privacy to the occupiers of nearby properties. Similarly, such distancing would not result in nearest properties to experience a detrimental loss of sunlight nor would the development appear overbearing or unduly dominant to properties in proximity to the application site.</p>
<p>Access, car parking and highway considerations</p>	<p>The development would add an additional two bedrooms within the application dwelling. The site benefits from a detached garage and a sizeable driveway that can accommodate parking for many vehicles. The development therefore retains adequate on-site car parking provision.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>The proposed development, which is located within land designated as Metropolitan Green Belt, would constitute inappropriate development and is therefore by definition harmful development. In addition to this harm, there would also be harm to the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Consequently the proposed development would conflict with Policies GBSP1 and RA3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan; Policy SADM34 of the Emerging Local Plan; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed development, by virtue of the extensions positioning, size and scale, would result in unduly dominant and overbearing additions to the dwelling that would fail to complement and reflect the design and appearance of the application dwelling. Accordingly, 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; Policies SP9 and SADM11 of the Emerging Local Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed development, which is located within land designated as Metropolitan Green Belt, would constitute inappropriate development and is therefore by definition harmful development. In addition to this harm, there would

also be harm to the openness of the Green Belt. No very special circumstances exist which outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Consequently the proposed development would conflict with Policies GBSP1 and RA3 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan; Policy SADM34 of the Emerging Local Plan; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development, by virtue of the extensions positioning, size and scale, would result in unduly dominant and overbearing additions to the dwelling that would fail to complement and reflect the design and appearance of the application dwelling. Accordingly, 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; Policies SP9 and SADM11 of the Emerging Local Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

- 3.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
1605/00	#	Site Location	28 June 2022
1605/01	#	Site Plan As Existing And Proposed	28 June 2022
1605/02	#	Floor Plans As Existing	28 June 2022
1605/03	#	Elevations And Sections As Existing	28 June 2022
1605/04	#	Floor Plans As Proposed	28 June 2022
1605/05	#	Elevations And Sections As Proposed	28 June 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
19 August 2022