

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR (PLANNING)**

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2022/2901/HOUSE
Location: 42 Daffodil Close Hatfield Hertfordshire AL10 9FF
Proposal: Erection of 3 storey extension to front elevation, ground floor rear extension, garage conversion to granny annex and first floor gym area.
Officer: Ms Elizabeth Mugova

Recommendation: Refused

6/2022/2901/HOUSE

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is a detached two storey dwelling located to the south of Daffodil Close. Attached to the side of the dwellinghouse is a double garage. The streetscene is residential in character and contain modern detached dwellings.</p> <p>This application seeks planning permission for the erection of three storey front extension, single storey rear extension, conversion of a double garage to form a granny annex and increase in height of the garage to facilitate loft conversion to create a gym.</p>
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>AAS - Area of Archaeological Significance Area of Archaeological Significance : AAS12 - Distance: 0 SAG - 0 - Distance: 0 SCA - 93253466.3872 - Distance: 0 GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 41.79 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>
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: S6/1999/0971/FP Decision: Approval Subject to s106 Decision Date: 30 June 2000 Proposal: Erection of 144 houses and 26 flats with associated access roads, garages, parking areas and public open spaces, cycleways and footways</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2002/0967/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 04 October 2002 Proposal: Erection of 46 dwellings (amendments to planning approval ref. S6/1999/971/FP)</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2005/0710/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 04 August 2005</p>

	<p>Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension</p> <p>Application Number: S6/2010/0932/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 20 July 2010 Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension with conservatory and formation of front door canopy</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0
Publicity	Neighbour letters		
Summary of neighbour responses	<p>40 Daffodil Close - Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of privacy due to the first floor garage extension and the front dormer windows • The garage forms part of our perimeter wall and as far as we can see, the only way the proposed extension can be built is for scaffolding to be put on our property. • Garage roof height extension would be overbearing and loss of sunlight on rear garden of No. 40 • Dust, noise and the inconvenience that goes with the building work of this large scale • Loss of parking space by converting the garage into habitable space. • The proposed annex can easily be rented out separately in future and this could further increase loading on off-street parking. • No 42 is a large 5 bedroom house and the proposed extensions would make it far too large for the plot of land it occupies. 		
Consultees and responses	<p>Hatfield Town Council – Major Objection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would be grossly out of keeping with the rest of the street • Extension to the garage is likely to be overbearing to the neighbouring property at 40 Daffodil Close • Proposed dormer windows overlooking the garden of 40 Daffodil Close. • Loss of two parking spaces • If minded to grant planning permission via DMC, suggest a condition which would prevent the "granny annex" being used as a separate dwelling • Ensure the correct party wall agreements are in place before work commences. 		
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 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			
<p>The Welwyn Hatfield Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission (August 2016) Incorporating The Proposed Main Modifications (January 2023) (Draft Local Plan)</p> <p>SP1 Delivering Sustainable Development SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse</p>			

Main Issues
Is the development within a conservation area?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be preserved or enhanced?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Comment (if applicable):
Would the development reflect the character of the area?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>Comment (if applicable): The NPPF places great emphasis upon achieving good quality design. 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..”</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 extensions should be designed to complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling.</p> <p>The comments from Hatfield Town Council and No. 40 Daffodil Close are noted.</p> <p>This application is seeking permission for a three-storey front extension, single storey rear extension, garage conversion to form granny annex and increase in height of the garage to facilitate loft conversion to create a gym.</p> <p>The area is characterised by modern two-storey detached dwellings which are similar in character and design. The application property is located in a prominent position within the streetscene. The application property has a higher ridgeline which results in a higher degree of pitch when compared with adjoining properties at Nos 40 and 44 Daffodil Close.</p> <p>The proposed three storey front extension would project beyond the front plane of the host dwelling by approximately 0.7m. Furthermore, the front extension would incorporate juliet balconies at the first and second floor and a pitched roof with clear glass. The entrance area would be changed to a double door with a flat glass canopy. The proposal would add significant bulk and massing to the front of the property and greatly alter the appearance and character of the existing dwelling. It’s been observed that front extensions are not characteristic in Daffodil Close. As such, the proposal would be unduly prominent within the streetscene, causing significant harm to the character and appearance of the close.</p> <p>The existing double garage doors would be replaced with an entrance door and a bay window to match the existing bay windows. The ridgeline of the double garage would be increased from 5 metres to 6.2 metres to allow the use of the roof space as habitable accommodation and the insertion of two front dormers. Although front dormer windows are a common feature within Daffodil Close, dormer windows installed to an altered garage are alien within the streetscene. However, the increase in height is quite minor and the resultant pitch would match the main roof of the dwelling. The dormers would also match the ones on the host dwelling. The changes to the garage would not, therefore, appear discordant or visually intrusive. Although other garages do not feature dormers, this element of the proposal is sufficiently complementary to avoid resultant harm to the character</p>

and appearance of the dwelling or its surroundings.

To the rear of the property, the proposal is to create a single storey extension and patio area. By virtue of its height and depth, the rear extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. It is therefore considered that this element of the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Notwithstanding the single storey rear extension and the use of matching materials, the cluttered arrangement and visual dominance due to the front extension and new bay window would appear incongruous with the character of the host dwelling and the area. It is therefore considered that the proposal would represent a poor standard of design in conflict with local and national policies.

Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): See above

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

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): The impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings is considered in terms of the impact on neighbouring properties access to day/sun/sky light, privacy, overbearing and overshadowing. Policy D1 of the District Plan seeks to provide a good standard of design in all new development. The Council's SPD on design supplements Policy D1 outlining that residential applications for extensions and alterations should not cause loss of light or be unduly dominant from adjoining properties, as a result of either the depth of the projection, the height or proximity of the extension.

The comments received from No. 40 Daffodil Close and Hatfield Town Council regarding impact on neighbour amenity are acknowledged.

In terms of the single storey rear extension, the dwelling being detached, it is not considered that it would result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of any neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of light, appearing unduly dominant or resulting in an impact on privacy.

The application property fronts a play area, as such, it is not considered that the proposed Juliet balconies would have any adverse impact in terms of loss of privacy.

The rear garden of No. 40 Daffodil Close backs onto the garage of the application site and there is approximately 10m between the flank wall of the garage and the rear windows at this neighbouring property. The eaves of the garage would only increase marginally (by approx. 0.5m) and the increase in height would relate to a roof which narrows to a ridge, therefore, the apparent increase in bulk would be limited when viewed from No.40. Also, in terms of outlook from No.40, it is notable that the extension would be viewed against the backdrop of the host dwelling. It is therefore considered that the alteration to the garage would not result in material overshadowing or loss of light to neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed front dormers above the existing garage would result in unacceptable overlooking of No. 40 Daffodil Close rear garden. It is therefore considered that the front dormers would result in a loss of privacy and harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, in conflict with local and national policies.

Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if applicable): Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states that if setting local parking standards authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the

development, availability of public transport; local car ownership levels and the overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. Saved Policy M14 of the District Plan and the Parking Standards SPG use maximum standards and are not consistent with the NPPF and are therefore afforded less weight. In August 2014 the Cabinet Housing and Planning Panel approved the Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards and Garage Sizes document. This document identifies the car parking standards set out in the SPG Parking Standards as guidelines rather than maximums and states that parking provision will be assessed on a case by case basis.

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms from five to six bedrooms. The Council's car parking guidance for a dwelling with four or more bedrooms in this location is three spaces per dwelling. The dwellinghouse, as originally designed, has a provision of four car parking spaces i.e. two spaces within the garage and two parking spaces on the hardstanding in front of the garage. As such, the proposal would result in the loss of two car parking spaces, retaining at least two spaces for the six-bedroom dwelling.

The proposal therefore would result in a shortfall of 1 on-site car parking space. Zone 4 in the SPG is a less accessible site within the Borough. Although the application site is not located in a convenient walking distance from the nearest train station, local shops and the town centre, there is unallocated lay-by parking next to the drive and opposite. In addition, Daffodil Close is an estate road within a defined residential area within which traffic will be mostly related to residential use. As such, it is considered that the shortfall of one car parking space would not have any significant impact on the operation of the road network or its safety. The Close is lightly trafficked and vehicle speeds low. Therefore, there is no objection in this regard.

Any other issues

Response to comments received

The neighbour at No. 40 has raised concerns regarding dust and noise. However, it is generally accepted that construction works will result in some noise and dust but it should not result in long-term impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Generally, noise from construction works is considered to be acceptable commencing on site between 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday and between 08:00 – 13:00 on Saturdays and would not be considered a statutory nuisance covered by the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

The concern regarding scaffolding is a private matter that should be discussed between the neighbours and is not a planning consideration.

Conclusion

By reason of its siting, size, scale and design the proposed three storey front extension and new bay window would result in a cluttered and incongruous form of development, harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling are surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would represent a poor standard of design in conflict with District Plan Policies D1, D2 and GBSP2; Policy SP9 of the Emerging Local Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed front dormer windows by reason of their siting would result in unacceptable overlooking of the rear garden of No. 40 Daffodil Close. Consequently, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, in conflict with Policies D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; Policy SADM11 of Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. By reason of its siting, size, scale and design the proposed three storey front extension and new bay window would result in a cluttered and incongruous form of development which would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling are the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would represent a poor standard of design in conflict with District Plan Policies D1, D2 and GBSP2; Policy SP9 of the Emerging Local Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed front dormer windows by reason of their siting would result in unacceptable overlooking of the rear garden of No. 40 Daffodil Close. Consequently, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers, in conflict with Policies D1 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; Policy SADM11 of Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

3.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
22/70	B	Existing Floor Plans	22 December 2022
22/73	B	Proposed Elevations	22 December 2022
22/74	B	Block Plan and Proposed Patio Area to Rear Garden	22 December 2022
		Location Plan	22 December 2022
22/71	B	Existing Elevations	30 December 2022
22/72	B	Proposed Floor Plans	30 December 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
13 March 2023