

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2019/0728/HOUSE  
**Location:** 111 Eddington Crescent Welwyn Garden City AL7 4SX  
**Proposal:** Installation of a dormer window to facilitate a loft conversion  
**Officer:** Mr A Commenville

**Recommendation:** Refused

6/2019/0728/HOUSE

<b>Context</b>	
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling contained within an average sized linear plot.</p> <p>Eddington Crescent is a narrow road with no parking restrictions. However on observation there is pressure on on-street car parking spaces during the day throughout the estate.</p> <p>The site is located within an established residential development and bounded to the south by Metropolitan Green Belt.</p> <p>Planning permission is sought for the erection of a rear dormer window and rooflight. Planning permission has recently been granted for a single storey side and rear extension and partial conversion of garage.</p>
<b>Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)</b>	<p>GB - Greenbelt - Distance: 0.58</p> <p>ROW - FOOTPATH (WELWYN GARDEN CITY 067) - Distance: 4</p> <p>Wards - Hollybush - Distance: 0</p> <p>HPGU - Hatfield Woodhall - Distance: 0</p> <p>HHAA - Hatfield Heritage Assessment Area(Green Corridor) - Distance: 0</p>
<b>Relevant planning history</b>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2017/0363/HOUSE    Decision: Granted    Decision Date: 26 April 2017</p> <p>Proposal: Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and partial conversion of garage.</p> <p>Application Number: N6/2004/1483/DE    Decision: Approval Subject to s106 Decision Date: 06 May 2005</p> <p>Proposal: RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOLLOWING OUTLINE PERMISSION C6/0482/1988/OP, FOR THE ERECTION OF 309 HOUSES AND FLATS, ACCESS ROADS, GARAGES AND PARKING COURTYARDS</p>

<p>Application Number: C6/1988/0482/OP      Decision: Approval Subject to s106  Decision Date: 29 September 2003</p> <p>Proposal: Site for residential development on site of squash club and former secondary school</p> <p>Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Development Order 1988 /9Amended) the provisions of part 1 and part 2, class A of Schedule 2 to that Order shall not apply to any dwelling constructed as part of this consent.</p>			
<b>Consultations</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Publicity</b>			
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No representations have been received.</li> </ul>		
<b>Consultees and responses</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council - Councillor Nick Pace</li> <li>Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council - Councillor Lynn Chesterman</li> <li>HCC - Rights of Way (South) - Dawn Grocock- Do not wish to comment this application.</li> <li>Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council - Councillor Margaret Birleson</li> <li>The Gardens Trust - The Gardens Trust - Do not wish to comment this application.</li> </ol>		
<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 Others: Supplementary Planning Guidance – Parking Standards, Interim Policy for Car Parking Standards and Garage Sizes  <u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016</u> SP4 Transport and Travel SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SADM2 Highway Network and Safety SADM11 Amenity and Layout SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse			
<b>Main Issues</b>			
<b>Is the development within a conservation area?</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
<b>Would the significance of the designated heritage asset be preserved or enhanced?</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No			
<b>Comment</b> (if applicable):			

**Would the development reflect the character of the area?**

Yes  No

**Comment** (if applicable):

Permitted development rights for extensions were removed in the original permission for these properties reference C6/1988/0482/OP however this does not cover the extension of roof space.

The proposed dormer would be contained within the roof slope and would appear subservient to the roof of the dwelling. The proposal would respect the character and appearance of the dwelling, and surrounding area. Furthermore, given its siting within the streetscene, it would not be highly visible from the streetscene.

In addition, the proposed rooflight would be modest in scale and would respect the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

**Would the development reflect the character of the dwelling?**

Yes  No  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable): See explanation above.

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

Yes  No  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable):

It is acknowledged that the amount of glazing proposed would result in an additional impact and some overlooking towards No.113 Eddington Crescent rear amenity space. However, while it is noted that no objections have been received, it is also noted that the extent of overlooking would be consistent with a neighbouring relationship generally expected between residential properties and would be to some extent comparable to the views from the existing first floor windows. It is therefore not considered that the scope of additional overlooking would be sufficient to be considered unacceptably harmful to the privacy of the occupants of No. 113.

For the above reasons, it is considered that while the erection of a rear dormer window would increase the impact upon this neighbour's amenity, it is not considered that this would result in such an additional impact upon the amenities of any neighbouring occupiers in respect of privacy and outlook impacts to warrant the refusal of the application.

**Would the development provide / retain sufficient parking?**

Yes  No  N/A

**Comment** (if applicable):

Paragraph 105 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 need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for ultra-low emission vehicle. Saved 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.

The property once extended would be a 4 bedroom property. Three on site car parking spaces are

required. Two parking spaces are available on site. However, no plan has been put forward which indicates 3 on-site car parking spaces on the frontage.

No supporting statement has been provided to justify the shortfall of car parking spaces on site. The Case Officer made an assessment of the local area on the site visit and it is noted that there are no parking restrictions. However, the road is narrow with numerous dropped kerbs and evidence of on-street car parking pressures within Eddington Crescent and wider estate during working hours where it is expected that on-street demand would be less. The potential for an additional car parking on the road would add to the parking pressures within the vicinity and consequently would exacerbate the existing problems of inconvenience to pedestrians. Furthermore, if planning permission were to be granted it would be difficult to resist similar applications from neighbouring properties. Although each proposal must be considered on its own merits, repetition of this type of development would result in a cumulative impact which would be likely to further increase the stress on parking provision within the locality resulting in a harmful effect on the character of the area.

Therefore the proposal fails to provide adequate on-site parking to accommodate the proposed development resulting in increased levels of car parking resulting in harm to the safety and operation to the public highway. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005, the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards 2004 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

**Any other issues**

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, as a result of the existing parking pressures of on-street parking within the locality and the additional pressure to increase the number of vehicles on street, would have a harmful effect on the character of the surrounding area. Although the design of the proposed dormer is considered to respect the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding streetscene, this would not outweigh the adverse harm to the locality as identified above. Accordingly, the proposed development would conflict with Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The proposal fails to provide adequate on-site parking to accommodate the additional proposed development which is likely to result in increased levels of car parking demand on a street already suffering from significant levels of on street and on footpath parking. The development is likely to add to demand on street resulting in harm to the safety and operation to the public highway. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policies D1, D2 and M14 of the District Plan 2005, the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005, the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking Standards 2004 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

**REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS**

2.

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
2437 PL 03		Proposed Floor Plans	27 March 2019
2437 PL 04		Existing and Proposed	27 March 2019

	Elevations	
2437 PL 02	Exsiting Floor Plans	27 March 2019
2437 PL 01	Location,Existing and Proposed Roof Plans	27 March 2019

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 Michael Robinson  
21 May 2019