

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2024/0337/HOUSE  
**Location:** 9 South Drive Cuffley Potters Bar Hertfordshire EN6 4HP  
**Proposal:** Retention of two dormers and erection of two dormers on each side facing roofslope  
**Officer:** Ms Ashley Ransome

**Recommendation:** Refused

6/2024/0337/HOUSE

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>The application site is located to the eastern side of South Drive and is comprised of a detached bungalow with a single detached outbuilding (formerly a garage) and front and rear gardens.</p> <p>This part of South Drive is characterised by bungalows that are similar in scale and style, with the exception being No. 17 South Drive which is located at the end of this row of dwellings. Excluding No.17, the bungalows feature a variety of materials but have key characteristics replicated on each bungalow, including an arched entranceway with brick detailing and a hipped or gabled front facing feature, along with a garage sited within the rear garden.</p> <p>This application seeks planning permission for the retention of two dormers and erection of two dormers on each side facing roofslope.</p> <p><u>Background</u></p> <p>The application site benefits from a Certificate of Lawful development approved under application reference 6/2022/2803/LAWP for the erection of two dormers, one on either side of the roof. The dormers were to be sited to the rear of the original rear roof. The applicant advises that the approved dormers were not constructed in the approved position under application reference 6/2022/2803/LAWP.</p> <p>A rear extension and roof alteration from hip to gable was granted under application reference 6/2022/2698/HOUSE. It is within the roofslope of the extended dwelling that dormers were initially inserted, rather than within the original roofslope of the dwelling as approved under application reference 6/2022/2803/LAWP. Furthermore, the dormers that are in situ are larger than those approved under application reference 6/2022/2803/LAWP.</p> <p>Rather than remove the dormers, the applicant sought to retain the unauthorised works, as well as erect two further dormers, one on either side of the roofslope.</p> <p>Planning application 6/2023/1934/HOUSE was therefore submitted for the retention of two dormers and erection of two dormers on each side facing roofslope. During a site visit for this previous application, the case officer witnessed that a sizeable dormer has been built either side of the roofslope with no indication that two smaller dormers were built beforehand. The case</p>

	<p>officer therefore queried the construction method and timeline of the existing dormers. The applicant, during the previous application of 6/2023/1934/HOUSE, did not advance any evidence to show that there were two smaller dormers before the two larger dormers were constructed. It was therefore considered that the two larger dormers witnessed on site had been constructed without smaller dormers being constructed beforehand. The description of development was therefore not considered to be accurate and was amended to the “Retention of two dormers and erection of two dormers on each side facing roofslope”.</p> <p>Subsequently, application reference 6/2023/1934/HOUSE was refused for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The positioning, design and scale of the dormers does not represent high-quality design and the development is contrary to Local Plan Policies SP9 and SADM11; the Council’s Supplementary Design Guidance; Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan Policy D2; and the National Planning Policy Guidance.</li> <li>2. The dormer facing towards No. 11 would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupiers of No. 11 and would therefore be contrary to Local Plan Policy SADM11; the Council’s Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</li> </ol> <p>Turning to the application currently before the Council. The applicant again seeks planning permission for the retention of two dormers and erection of two dormers on each side facing roofslope. The development has not changed since the previously refused application of 6/2023/1934/HOUSE. Supporting information has been submitted with this application which indicates that the two larger dormers towards the rear of the building were built first, then the two smaller dormers (similar to those approved under application 6/2022/2803/LAWP) were constructed and joined together to create one large dormer to each side of the dwelling. This is not disputed.</p> <p>Upon visiting the site, it was clear that all four side dormers (now two large dormers) had been fully constructed. As such, the description of the application is not fully representative of the development. The description of the development should therefore read “retention of one dormer on each side facing roofslope”. Moreover, the submitted plans are incorrect insofar as the elevation drawings show the dormers approved under application reference 6/2022/2803/LAWP as “pre-existing”. However, as discussed above, these two dormers were not the first to be constructed and thus are incorrectly shown as pre-existing on the plans. The plans also show the development as proposed, however the development already exists.</p> <p>Within the submission of this current application, further information has also been submitted by way of providing detailed examples of other dormers within the vicinity to try to overcome the previous reasons for refusal.</p>
<p><b>Constraints</b></p>	<p>NPA - Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan Area - Distance: 0  PAR - PARISH (NORTHAW AND CUFFLEY) - Distance: 0  Wards - Northaw &amp; Cuffley - Distance: 0  HEN - No known habitats present (medium priority for habitat creation) - Distance: 0  SAGB - Sand and Gravel Belt - Distance: 0</p>

<b>Relevant planning history</b>	<p>Application Number: 6/2022/1414/HOUSE  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 19 August 2022  Proposal: Insertion of two front facing dormers and two side dormers either side of the roofslope, erection of a two storey rear extension and conversion of loft into habitable space</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/2114/HOUSE  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 28 October 2022  Proposal: Installation of side dormers and erection of a single storey rear extension with loft space converted into habitable space</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/2803/LAWP  Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 17 January 2023  Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of two dormers on both sides of the roof</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/2727/LAWP  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 18 January 2023  Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of front porch</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2022/2698/HOUSE  Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 23 January 2023  Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension with extension and alteration of roof from hip to gable</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2023/0200/LAWP  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 13 March 2023  Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of a porch</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2023/0657/HOUSE  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 19 May 2023  Proposal: Erection of the front porch</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2023/1237/LAWP  Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 02 August 2023  Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of a porch</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2023/1252/LAWP  Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 04 August 2023  Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for the erection of swimming pool enclosure with swimming pool.</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2023/1638/VAR  Decision: Withdrawn  Decision Date: 31 August 2023  Proposal: Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) on planning permission</p>
----------------------------------	--

	<p>6/2022/2698/HOUSE and condition 2 (approved plans) on planning permission 6/2022/2803/LAWP</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2023/1934/HOUSE  Decision: Refused  Decision Date: 18 December 2023  Proposal: Retention of two dormers and erection of two dormers on each side facing roof slope</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2023/2531/HOUSE  Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 01 March 2024  Proposal: Retention of the refurbishment and conversion of a pre-existing garage adjoining a pool enclosure, to an outbuilding for gym/office use</p>		
<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 1	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>	Neighbour Letters		
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed side dormer over the rear extension, which has been built without planning permission, presents an overbearing presence. Its domineering appearance of the side dormers, with its dark bulkiness, casts a shadow over my rear patio.</li> <li>• The owner's lack of regard and concern to the planning laws is apparent as what is constructed is the previously refused application 6/2022/2114/HOUSE and 6/2023/1934/HOUSE.</li> <li>• Furthermore, the current planning application is identical to previously refused application 6/2023/1934/HOUSE. From what I can see, no changes have been made from the previously refused application.</li> </ul>		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council – No response received.		
<b>Relevant Policies and Guidance</b>			
<b>National Planning Policy Framework</b>			
<b>The Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Local Plan 2016-2036:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP1 Delivering Sustainable Development</li> <li>• SP3 Settlement Strategy and Green Belt Boundaries</li> <li>• SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design</li> <li>• SADM11 Amenity and Layout</li> <li>• SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse</li> <li>• SADM16 Ecology and Landscape</li> </ul>			
<b>Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan 2022-2036:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• D2 Local Character</li> </ul>			
<b>Planning Guidance:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplementary Design Guidance 2005</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Guidance Parking Standards 2004</li> <li>• Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards and Garage Sizes 2014</li> <li>• Planning Practice Guidance</li> </ul>			

Main Issues	
<p><b>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene)</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 131 of the NPPF clearly 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 135 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 139 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>The above objectives are broadly consistent with Policies SP1 and SP9 of the Council’s Local Plan. Policy SP9 states that proposals will be required to have been informed by an analysis of the site’s character and context so that they relate well to their surroundings and local distinctiveness, including the wider townscape and landscape, and enhance the sense of place. SP9 goes on to state that development proposals will need to respect neighbouring buildings and the surrounding context in terms of height, mass and scale and also be of a high quality architectural design that creates coherent and attractive forms and elevations and uses high quality materials.</p> <p>Paragraph 26.11 of the Local Plan states that the Council also has in place Supplementary Planning Guidance on parking standards (2004) and Supplementary Design Guidance (2005), both introduced in conjunction with the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan (2005). Both of these documents require review in due course in order to bring them up to date with current best practice on design and sustainable development but will continue to be used to inform decisions on planning applications until such review takes place.</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"> <li>- Respond to building forms and patterns of existing buildings in the detailed layout and design to reinforce a sense of place;</li> <li>- Use local materials and building methods/details to enhance local distinctiveness; and</li> <li>- Ensure that the scale, height, massing, and space around the new development in relation to the adjoining buildings is considered</li> </ul> <p>The Council’s Supplementary Design Guidance (SDG) states at paragraph 5.2 i) that “extensions should be designed to complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling and be subordinate in scale”. The SDG states at 5.2 vi) that “dormer windows should be contained within the roofslope, be subservient to the roof of the property and be in proportion to the existing fenestration of the property. They must not extend above the ridge height of the existing dwelling and the dormer cheeks should be at least 1 metre from the flank wall of the property or of the party wall with the adjoining property.”</p> <p>Moreover, Policy D2 of the Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan (NCNP) concerns the local character and Appendix 2 provides further guidance in support of Policy D2, with extracts from local character assessments that should be used to inform all development proposals. Under the heading ‘Household Extensions’ it states:</p>

- The original building should remain the dominant element of the property regardless the amount of extension. The newly built extension should not overwhelm the building from any given point.
- The pitch and form of the roof used on the building adds to its character and extensions should respond to this where appropriate.
- Extensions should consider the materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions of the existing building and recreate this style to design an extension that matches and complements the existing building.

Under the sub-heading 'Loft extensions' there is a diagram demonstrating acceptable and unacceptable alterations to a roof. The unacceptable examples shows a wide flat roofed dormer with annotation stating "Loft conversions incorporating a long shed dormer which is out of scale with the building".

Following the previously refused application of 6/2023/1934/HOUSE, the development submitted within this application remains the same. The main difference between the two applications is the further information that has been submitted to support the current application. Further information submitted includes a construction method and timeline with respect to the dormers being constructed and detailed examples of other dormers within the vicinity. This application is also fully retrospective, unlike the part retrospective application of 6/2023/1934/HOUSE. As a result, the report is similar to the previously refused application.

It is considered that the development is not acceptable in design terms. While the dormers do not exceed the ridge of the dwelling, they are set very minimally below the ridge, as well as only being minimally set up from the eaves. Furthermore, the rear facing dormer cheeks finish in line with the rear elevation of the dwelling. The dormers therefore occupy the majority of their respective roofslope, which includes the additional roofslope created by the recently completed rear extension and are further emphasised by the positioning of the dormers within the roofslope. The scale and design of the fenestration within the dormers is also out of keeping with the existing fenestration within the flank elevations of the dwelling.

The dormers are substantial in size and scale, resulting in a development that is not subservient to the roof of the property. The dormers appear as an awkward and incongruous addition to the application site, as well as appearing unduly prominent within the street scene due to its significant bulk and mass, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Regard is had to the examples of dormer windows within the wider area advanced by the applicant. The examples will be considered in turn below:

- No.31 Theobalds Road- no planning application on record for the side dormers. Notwithstanding, the single dormer on each side of the property is set down from the ridge, set significantly up from the eaves and set in from either end.
- No.30 Theobalds Road- planning permission was granted under reference S6/2003/0643/FP and S6/2003/1589/FP in 2003 and 2004

respectively and as such were not assessed against the current development plan or the NPPF. Notwithstanding, there are two dormers on either side of the property with a substantial gap between the two dormers, as well as being set down from the ridge, set significantly up from the eaves and set in from either end.

- No.28 Theobalds Road- planning permission granted under reference 6/2021/2791/HOUSE in 2021 and as such were not assessed against the current development plan or the latest version of the NPPF. Notwithstanding, one large dormer to each side of the property, and whilst they are large in terms of width, the dormers are set significantly up from the eaves.
- No.15 Theobalds Road- no planning application on record for the side dormer. Notwithstanding, the dormer is set significantly up from the eaves and set in from either end.
- No.17 Theobalds Road- planning permission was granted under reference E6/1972/5908/ in 1972 and as such were not assessed against the current development plan or the NPPF. Notwithstanding, the dormer is set down from the ridge, set significantly up from the eaves and set in from either end.
- No.19 Theobalds Road- planning permission was granted under reference 6/2017/1069/HOUSE in 2017 and as such were not assessed against the current development plan or the latest version of the NPPF. Notwithstanding, the dormers are set significantly up from the eaves and set in from either end.
- No.18 Theobalds Road- planning permission was granted under reference 6/2019/3223/HOUSE in 2020 and as such were not assessed against the current development plan or the NPPF. Notwithstanding, the dormers are set significantly up from the eaves and set in from either end.

Although each planning application must be considered on its individual merits, it is accepted that extensions and alterations to neighbouring properties inform the character of the area, and this is a material consideration when assessing applications. In this case, it is notable that none of the examples advanced by the applicant are visible from the application site, all being sited within the adjoining road (Theobalds Road). Moreover, the dormers to properties within Theobalds Road are not directly comparable to the development at No.9 South Drive, being generally smaller in scale and demonstrating design variations. Finally, it is notable that none of the examples advanced by the applicant were not assessed under the current development plan or the latest version of the NPPF. Indeed, some examples could be considered historic, and others were likely implemented in accordance with permitted development rights. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that decisions on planning applications should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the development plan comprises the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Local Plan 2016-2036 (Local Plan), adopted on 12th October 2023 and Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan (Neighbourhood Plan) adopted in May 2023.

	<p>As a consequence of the above, it is considered that the development represents a poor standard of design and is therefore contrary to Policies SP1 and SP9 of the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Local Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; Policy D2 of the Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan; and the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan, and there are no other considerations, including provisions in the NPPF, planning history or benefits of the proposal, which indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with it.</p>
<p><b>Impact on neighbours</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 130 of the NPPF seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future users of land and buildings. Policy SADM11 provides the local policy framework for assessing the impact of development on the residential amenity and living conditions of neighbouring properties and aims to ensure adequate amenity for future occupiers of the proposed development. This is expanded upon in the Council's SDG which outlines that development should be designed and built to ensure that there is a satisfactory level of sunlight and daylight, that adequate amenity space is provided and that overlooking is minimised.</p> <p>The neighbour representations that have been received are acknowledged.</p> <p>The concerns regarding the scale, design and impact of the development have been addressed earlier in the report.</p> <p>The planning system allows retrospective planning approvals which this application aims to attain.</p> <p>Following the previously refused application of 6/2023/1934/HOUSE, the development submitted within this application remains the same. The main difference between the two applications is the further information that has been submitted to support the current application which is detailed earlier within this report. As a result, the report is similar to the previously refused application.</p> <p>The application site and adjoining neighbours No.7 and No.11 have rear gardens that face east, experiencing sunlight in the mornings. The scale and positioning of the development would not result in adjoining neighbours to experience an undue loss of light.</p> <p>While the dormers are considerable in scale, they are not considered to be of a size that would have an unduly overbearing or undue dominance towards adjoining neighbours.</p> <p>The dormer facing towards No.7 has three windows and the dormer facing towards No.11 has one window within the respective flank elevations.</p> <p>The windows facing No.7 serve two non-habitable spaces (staircase and ensuite) and a bedroom. The windows serving the non-habitable spaces could be secured by condition to be obscured glazed in the event of an approval to maintain the privacy of the occupiers of No.7. The bedroom would also be served by Juliet balconies within the rear elevation and so the flank window serving the bedroom could be obscured glazed as the Juliet balcony would allow sufficient light and outlook to maintain good quality internal living space, while also maintaining the privacy of the occupiers of No.7.</p>



	<p>The window within the dormer facing towards No.11 serves a bedroom. No.11 has rooflights within the roofslope facing towards the application dwelling. The dormer window would allow direct views into No.11's rooflights due to the positioning of the window within the dormer and orientation and positioning of the rooflights. However, no other windows serve the bedroom, and an obscured glazed window would result in poor internal accommodation for future occupiers.</p> <p>The dormer facing towards No.11 would therefore result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupiers of No.11 as a result of overlooking towards the rooflights within the north facing roofslope of No.11. The dormer is therefore contrary to Policy SADM11 of the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Local Plan; the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>
<p><b>Access, car parking and highway considerations</b></p>	<p>Paragraph 111 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; the availability of and opportunities for public transport; local car ownership levels; and the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.</p> <p>Policy SADM12 of the Local Plan in regard to parking is informed by the standards that are set out within the Council's parking standards. The Parking Standards SPG use maximum standards that are not consistent with the Framework and are therefore afforded less weight. In light of this, the Council have produced an Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards that states that parking provision will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and the existing maximum parking standards within the SPG should be taken as guidance only. This means that higher or lower car parking standards than those set out in the SPG can be proposed and determined on a case-by-case basis taking into account the relevant circumstances of the proposal, its size, context, and its wider surroundings.</p> <p>The development would result in the dwelling to have five bedrooms. A four or more bedroom dwelling in this location should provide three on-site car parking spaces.</p> <p>South Drive has experienced parking pressures as evidenced by car parking restrictions in the area in place from 11am – 1pm Monday to Friday.</p> <p>The application site benefits from an area of hardstanding to the front of the property suitable to park one vehicle. The site also features a shared driveway with No.11 which leads to a garage to the rear of the application site. Due to the shared driveway however, a further vehicle could not park within the site without obstructing access to the garage of No.11.</p> <p>Following a recent application under reference 6/2023/2531/HOUSE, the pre-existing garage has been converted. Due to extensions which constrained the site, it was considered in the previous application that the existing garage was not suitable to house a vehicle and therefore the existing garage could not have reasonably been considered to provide off-street parking. The site therefore relies on the existing driveway which previously provided one on-site parking space. Notwithstanding, as seen within the surrounding street scene, a number of other properties along South Drive have extended their</p>

	<p>hardstanding across the frontage of their sites to accommodate further on-site parking. Similar works could be undertaken to the application site to create three on-site parking spaces.</p> <p>Moreover, an under provision of on-site car parking was considered to be acceptable under approved application 6/2022/2698/HOUSE for the erection of a single storey rear extension and alteration of roof form from hip to gable. This approval resulted in the increase of bedrooms within the dwelling from three to four. This was because the approved application of 6/2022/2698/HOUSE followed a previously approved certificate of lawfulness under application 6/2022/2803/LAWP. The certificate of lawfulness created additional bedrooms, however, a certificate of lawfulness does not require on-site car parking to be considered as part of the application. Therefore, it would not have been reasonable for the Local Authority to withhold planning approval on the basis of an under provision of car parking.</p> <p>The development has not been implemented as approved under application 6/2022/2803/LAWP and so this approval could only be implemented under a hypothetical situation in which the current dormers are removed and then the approved dormers are implemented. While this situation may be very unlikely, it is an option that nonetheless the application dwelling benefits from. Similar to the conclusions drawn under application 6/2022/2698/HOUSE, it is therefore not considered reasonable to withhold planning approval on the basis of an under provision of car parking, as the site would still have an under provision of car parking should the development under application 6/2022/2803/LAWP be implemented.</p>
<b>Biodiversity</b>	<p>Biodiversity net gain (BNG) is a way of creating and improving natural habitats. BNG makes sure development has a measurably positive impact ('net gain') on biodiversity, compared to what was there before development. A mandatory BNG of 10% applies to major development sites from 12<sup>th</sup> February 2024 and to small sites from the 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2024. This application was received as valid on the 26<sup>th</sup> March 2024 and is not a major development, therefore mandatory BNG does not apply.</p> <p>Paragraph 180 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and delivering net gains in biodiversity where possible. Paragraph 186 of the NPPF goes on to list principles that Local Authorities should apply when determining a planning application. It is stated within Paragraph 186(d) of the NPPF that "opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged".</p> <p>Local Plan Policy SADM16 seeks to conserve the biodiversity of the Borough and seek opportunities for enhancement to ensure no net loss of biodiversity. The Policy sets out that proposals will be expected to maintain, protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity, the structure and function of ecological networks and the ecological status of water bodies.</p> <p>No information has been submitted in relation to conserving biodiversity, nor providing details of opportunities for enhancement. However, it is considered that this could reasonably be secured through a condition if this application were recommended for approval.</p>
<b>Other matters</b>	<p>Upon visiting the site, it was observed that the materials of the dwelling had</p>

	been altered, including the application of slate effect tiles to the porch, and to a plinth below the rendered front and flank elevations, and also in quoin detailing. There is no planning permission for these materials, nor are they included within this application and as such this alteration is unlawful.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan, and there are no other considerations, including provisions in the NPPF, planning history or benefits of the proposal, which indicate that the development should be determined other than in accordance with it. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.	

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The development, by virtue of its siting, size, mass and scale, is excessive and is not subservient to the roof of the property. It appears as an incongruous and unduly prominent addition within the street scene, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, the development represents a poor standard of design and is therefore contrary to Policies SP1 and SP9 of the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Local Plan; the Supplementary Design Guidance; Policy D2 of the Northaw and Cuffley Neighbourhood Plan; and the National Planning Policy Framework..
  
2. The dormer facing towards No. 11 would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupiers of No. 11 and would therefore be contrary to Local Plan Policy SADM11; the Council’s Supplementary Design Guidance; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS**

3.	<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
	221103RD-00		Fire Strategy	22 February 2024
	221103RD-01		Site Location and Block Plans	27 March 2024
	221103RD-02		Ground Floor Plans	27 March 2024
	221103RD-03		First Floor Plans	27 March 2024
	221103RD-04		Roof Plans	27 March 2024
	221103RD-05		Front and Rear Elevations	27 March 2024
	221103RD-06		Right Elevations	27 March 2024

221103RD-  
07

Left Elevations

27 March 2024

221103RD-  
08

Sections

27 March 2024

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  
21 May 2024