

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2020/1837/FULL
Location: 54 Bridge Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 6UR
Proposal: Erection of new detached dwellinghouse to the rear garden.
Officer: Mr Raymond Lee

Recommendation: Refused

6/2020/1837/FULL

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is located on the north side of Bridge Road and comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling within a large plot with front, side and rear gardens. The site adjoins a public footpath to the side and rear.</p> <p>The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling in the rear garden of the site and associate new access.</p> <p>Planning permission (reference N6/2014/2504/FP) was previously granted for the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings in the rear gardens of No's 52 and 54 Bridge Road with an access off No. 52.</p> <p>A subsequent application (reference 6/2019/0879/FULL) for the erection of a pair of semi-detached properties to the rear of No. 54 Bridge Road with a new access was refused. The reason for refusal is stated in the relevant planning history section.</p> <p>The current application is a resubmission of 6/2019/0879/FULL. It is important to note that apart from the reduction in the number of dwellings being proposed, all other elements of the scheme is unchanged.</p>
Constraints (as defined within WHDP 2005)	<p>CA - Conservation Area: WGC1; - Distance: 0 EM - Estate Management - Distance: 0 SSSI - SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST (Sherrards Park Wood - SSSI1) - Distance: 92.29 ROW - BRIDLEWAY (WELWYN GARDEN CITY 013) - Distance: 3.07 SSSI - SITE OF SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC INTEREST (Sherrards Park Wood - SSSI1) - Distance: 92.29 UOL - Urban Open Land (Proposal map 2) - Distance: 0 Wards - Handside - Distance: 0 Wards - Sherrards - Distance: 7.28 CP - Cycle Path (National Cycle Network) - Distance: 7.94 CP - Cycle Path (Cycle Facility / Route) - Distance: 6.6 CP - Cycle Path (CYCLEABLE ROW / AGREEMENTS) - Distance: 8.75 FM00 - Flood Zone Surface Water 1000mm (7565090) - Distance: 0 HEN - Existing S41 NERC Act habitat - Distance: 0 HEN - No known habitats present (high priority for habitat creation) - Distance: 0</p>

	SAGB - Sand and Gravel Belt - Distance: 0 HPGU - Digswell Sherrardspark - Distance: 0		
Relevant planning history	<p>Application Number: 6/2019/0879/FULL Decision: Refused Decision Date: 20 June 2019 Proposal: Erection of 2 x two-bedroom semi-detached dwellings with associated vehicular access and parking</p> <p>Reasons for refusal:</p> <p><i>'The proposed development would represent an unduly cramped and over intensive form of development on the site, poorly related to the established special character and form of this part of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposal fails to maintain the landscaped greenery of the site failing to retain the appearance and ethos of the Garden City. Whilst this would result in less than substantial harm, in line with paragraph 196 of the NPPF the public benefits identified are not considered to outweigh the harm identified. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies D1, D2, D8 and R17 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; Policies SP9, SADM15 and SADM16 of the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016; and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.'</i></p> <p>Application Number: 6/2018/2232/PA Decision: Refused Decision Date: 14 December 2018 Proposal: Pre application advice for erection of 2 x two bedroom dwellings with vehicular access</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2017/2159/HOUSE Decision: Granted Decision Date: 06 December 2017 Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension with alterations to openings following part demolition of existing party wall</p> <p>Application Number: N6/2014/2504/FP Decision: Granted Decision Date: 22 June 2015 Proposal: Erection of two dwellings with associated garages and access</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 7	Other: 1
Publicity	Site Notice Display Date: 18 August 2020 Site Notice Expiry Date: 9 September 2020 Press Advert Display Date: 19 August 2020 Press Advert Expiry Date: 3 September 2020 Neighbour notification letters		
Summary of neighbour	7 letters of objections were received on ground of the following:		

responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment of the site • Loss of important garden space • Set a precedent of developments in rear gardens in the conservation area • Development contrary to the Garden City ethos • Loss of heritage • Development poorly reflects the character within the Conservation Area of Welwyn Garden City • Removal of section of hedgerow • Raising funds for personal gain is not a factor in deciding a planning application
Consultees and responses	<p>WHBC - Client Services – No objection.</p> <p>Natural England – Comment: Standing advice has been provided as the development has the potential to impact upon the Sherrardspark Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).</p> <p>Herts & Middlesex Bat Group – No comment received.</p> <p>Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust – No comment received.</p> <p>HCC Hertfordshire Transport Programmes & Strategy – No objections: <i>‘This level of development is unlikely to generate any extra movements which would ultimately lead to demonstrable harm to the highway network in terms of free flow and capacity therefore; the highway authority would not wish to restrict the grant of planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives.’</i></p> <p>Hertfordshire Ecology – No comment received.</p> <p>WHBC Landscapes Department – No comment.</p> <p>WHBC Parking Services – Comment: <i>‘This development is in Zone 2, therefore, there should be provision for two parking spaces for the new development as this is a 4 bedroom property. The existing property 54 Bridge Road which will remain in situ, is a 3 bedroom property therefore there should be provision for 1.5 parking spaces which means there needs to be provision for 4 parking spaces within the development.’</i></p> <p>The Gardens Trust – Objection: <i>‘the erection of the new house and the proposed driveway and parking would cause serious harm to the significance of the group of houses from 48 to 56 Bridge Road contrary to NPPF, WHBC policy and the provisions of the Conservation Area Appraisal.’</i></p> <p>The Ramblers' Association – Comment: <i>‘The footpath, where it is adjacent to the proposed works, should not be affected as a result of the works. Furthermore, during the works, and beyond, full continuous safe access to, and use of, the footpath should be maintained, with safety signage when appropriate during the works.’</i></p> <p>Lead Local Flood Authority – No comment received.</p> <p>WHBC Conservation Officer – Objection <i>‘the loss of some hedgerow for the creation of the driveway has a negative impact on the streetscene by undermining its verdant character, which is typical of the Garden City.’</i></p> <p>WHBC Tree Officer – no objection to the proposal in principle subject to condition for a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement.</p> <p>WHBC - Councillor Malcolm Cowan – objection: <i>‘I would like this called in because it is not clear how the extent of hard surfacing fits with policy when a</i></p>

<i>backland development, requiring access past the front property, is proposed.'</i>	
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 Others: SD1, R1, R2, R5, R11, R17, R19, R20, H2, D6, D8 Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 <u>Draft Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016 (Key Policies):</u> SP1 Delivering Sustainable Development SP4 Travel and Transport SP6 Community Services and Facilities SP9 Place Making and High Quality Design SP10 Sustainable Design and Construction SP11 Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets SADM1 Windfall Development SADM2 Highway Network and Safety SADM11 Amenity and Layout SADM12 Parking, Servicing and Refuse SADM15 Heritage SADM16 Ecology and Landscape	
Main Issues	
Principle of Development	District Plan Policy SD1 states that development proposals will be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the principles of sustainable development are satisfied and that they will accord with the objectives and policies of the District Plan. Policy R1 requires development to take place on previously developed land and Policy GBSP2 directs new development into the existing towns and specified settlements within the district. These objectives are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which supports the development of under-utilised land and buildings (para 118) and the efficient use of land (para 122) taking into account, amongst other criteria, the desirability of maintaining an area's prevailing character and the importance of securing well-designed and attractive places. The site has not been allocated for additional housing supply and as such comes forward as a windfall residential site where Policy H2 applies. Policy H2 of the District Plan 2005 relates specifically to applications for windfall housing development and states that all proposals of this type will be assessed for potential suitability against the following criteria: <i>(i) The availability of previously-developed sites and/or buildings;</i> <i>(ii) The location and accessibility of the site to services and facilities by transport modes other than the car;</i> <i>(iii) The capacity of existing and potential infrastructure to absorb further development;</i> <i>(iv) The ability to build new communities to support infrastructure and provide demand for services and facilities;</i> <i>(v) The physical and environmental constraints on development of land.</i> Policy SADM1 of the Draft Local Plan Submission 2016 is also relevant in regards to windfall housing development. This policy is similar to Policy H2 of

	<p>the District Plan 2005 but adds that the proposal should not undermine the delivery of allocated sites or the overall strategy of the Plan; and proposals would not result in disproportionate growth taking into account the position of a settlement within the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The current application seeks permission for the erection of a single new dwelling on land which forms part of the residential garden of 54 Bridge Road. Gardens in built-up areas are not classed as previously developed land, having lower priority for development, but that does not mean they cannot be built on in any circumstances. Although gardens are not a priority for development, the need to make efficient use of urban land remains a policy objective.</p> <p>The site is located within Welwyn Garden City which is designated in Policy GBSP2 as a sustainable location to which development will be directed. It is also located within an area which is accessible by non-car modes of transport and where there are services and facilities available within walking distance of the site. In principle there is no objection to this site being used for residential purposes in land use terms, subject to the physical and environmental constraints of the site and its immediate vicinity and other relevant planning policies.</p>
<p>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (appearance within the streetscene) and impact of setting of heritage assets</p>	<p>District Plan Policies D1 and D2 respectively require high quality design in all new development and for proposals to respect and relate to the character and context of their location, 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. Policy GBSP2 directs new development into the existing towns and specified settlements within the district, providing that it will be limited to that which is compatible with the maintenance and enhancement of their character. These policies are consistent with the design policies contained in the Emerging Local Plan (SP1 and SP9) and the NPPF.</p> <p>The revised NPPF has a stronger emphasis on good quality design than its predecessor. Paragraph 124 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. At paragraph 127 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 130 is clear that <i>"Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions..."</i></p> <p>The property is semi-detached with a large rear garden located within the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. The surrounding area is predominantly residential also with large rear gardens. These combine with the mature trees in the gardens to give the locality a relatively spacious character and appearance, which this property is in keeping with.</p> <p>There is a requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area in exercising planning functions as required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed</p>

Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The proposal seeks to erect a detached dwelling to the rear of the plot. The dwellings would feature a gable roof with red multi brickwork, burnt pan tiles and blackened weatherboarding. The windows would be painted white and feature Georgian glazing. The architectural design and detailing of the semi-detached pair of dwellings would reflect character and appearance of the properties within the streetscene of Bridge Road.

The previous application (reference N6/2014/2504/FP) granted planning permission for a pair of semi'-detached properties which combined the plots of both No.52 and No.54. The subsequent refused application (in which this application is based) sought to erect the pair of dwellings within just the rear garden of one plot (No. 54). The current scheme has reduced the number of dwellings proposed to one but the size and appearance of the building and the location of the proposed access has remained the same as the previously refused scheme.

It is considered that the introduction of a large 4 bed detached property to the rear of a modest semi-detached dwelling is not considered to follow the existing grain of development in the area. The footprint and scale of the proposed building would continue to appear overly large in comparison to the existing property to the front on the site. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling, together with the existing dwelling, would appear excessive and overdeveloped in comparison to the size of the plot, which would be out of keeping with the immediate character of the area. Whilst planning permission had previously been granted for the erection of two semi-detached dwellings, this spanned across two plots and the size of the dwellings were only approximately 11% smaller than the dwelling proposed in the current application. Although the amenity area for the proposed new dwelling would now be comparatively larger since it would serve just one dwelling, this is still not on par with the other properties in the area. Furthermore, the garden size for the existing dwelling (No. 54) would be very small due to the proposed access drive. As such the outcome would be that the proposal would have a cramped nature and would impact detrimentally on the overall spacious character and appearance of the locality as a whole. This harm would also be exacerbated as the development would be visible from public vantage points.

Turning to the impact upon the Conservation area, while the proposed dwelling is relatively well screened from Bridge Road due to its position towards the rear of the plot, the Conservation Officer states that the loss of part of the hedgerow for the creation of the driveway has a negative impact on the streetscene by undermining its verdant character, which is typical of the Garden City. On this basis, there would be 'less than substantial' harm to the Conservation Area and as per paragraph 196 of the NPPF, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

While the Council does not currently have a five year housing supply and the proposal would deliver an additional dwelling in a relatively sustainable location close to Welwyn Garden City Town Centre, the amount of development proposed the social and economic benefits derived from the occupation and construction of a single dwelling would be, at best, modest and can only be afforded limited weight. Although the applicant has stated in the covering letter that the sale of the proposed dwelling would help facilitate the renovation of the parent property (No. 54) which had falling into disrepair, this

	<p>property is not listed and no further details have been provided on the matter. As such the harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would not be outweighed by these benefits. A positive contribution to preservation is therefore not achieved and it is considered that development would cause detrimental harm upon the character or appearance of Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area contrary to both local and national planning policy.</p> <p>In conclusion, even with the reduction in number of dwellings being proposed, it is considered that the size of the plots would not be consistent with the substantive plot sizes and character and context of this area; harmful to the significance of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the area, causing harm and being at odds with the prevailing character and appearance of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area, contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the District Plan; Policies SP9 and SADM15 of the Emerging Local Plan and the NPPF.</p>
<p>Living conditions of future occupiers</p>	<p>Paragraph 127 NPPF outlines that decisions should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Policy SADM11 of the Emerging Local Plan 2016, requires as a minimum, for all proposals for C3 dwellings will be required to meet the Nationally Described Space Standard, unless it can be robustly demonstrated that this would not be feasible or viable. The Standards outline the minimum requirements floor space and storage for new dwellings.</p> <p>The proposal seeks permission for a 4 bedroom dwelling which would be of adequate size. No objections are raised in regard to the quality and standard of the internal layout and amenity for future occupiers.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>With regard to the impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours, Policy D1 and the SDG states that any extension should not cause loss of light or appear unduly dominant from an adjoining property. Policy SADM11 aims to preserve neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>It is noted that there were no significant harm identified to neighbour amenity in the previous refused scheme. The main property that is likely to be impacted upon is No.52 Bridge Road. The proposed dwelling would be located within the rear garden of No.54 approximately 1 metre from the shared boundary. There are two first floor side elevation windows proposed which would serve en suite bathrooms which could be conditioned as obscure glazed and non-opening to ensure the level of privacy of both occupiers is maintained to an acceptable level in the event of a grant of permission. As a result of window design and separation distance, there are no concerns with regard to overlooking to No.52.</p> <p>The siting of the dwellings would introduce built form close to the boundary of No.52, which would impact upon their outlook to some degree, whereby the existing rear garden is spacious and open. However, the dwellings would sit alongside the rear garden of No.52 and the separation distance is such that it is not considered the proposed development would result in a detrimental loss of light, appear unduly dominant or result in a loss of privacy to warrant refusal of the application.</p> <p>In terms of noise and disturbance, the vehicular access to the rear of the site would wrap around the plot and parking is proposed to the side and rear of that</p>

	<p>garden. The occupiers of No. 54 would likely experience additional noise and light spillage from cars manoeuvring around the site, as well as noise from closing car doors and cars entering and leaving the site. However the current scheme has reduced the density of the proposal and would result in a modest decrease in vehicle movements to and from the site. It is therefore not considered that this would result in a detrimental impact on their living conditions to warrant refusal of the application.</p>
<p>Access, car parking and highway considerations</p>	<p>In terms of parking, 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 overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles. District Plan Policy M14 and the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) use maximum standards and are not consistent with the Framework and are therefore afforded less weight. In light of the above, 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.</p> <p>The site falls within Zone 2 where the guideline parking requirement is 2 on site car parking spaces for this development. The proposed plans indicate the dwelling would benefit from 2 on site spaces which meets the requirement of 4-bedroom dwelling in this location in line with the Council's SPG guidance. Furthermore, there is a bike store being proposed in the rear garden of the new dwelling.</p> <p>It has been noted that an additional space has been accommodated in the proposed parking area for No.54 Bridge Road. Whilst Parking services department has requested for 2 spaces for the existing 3 bed property which is to remain in situ, the existing site does not benefit from vehicular access and on-site car parking. The site is also located within a sustainable location within walking distance to the Town centre with access to public transport modes. As such the on-site car parking provision is considered to be acceptable to support the proposed development.</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council have commented on the application and have confirmed the proposed access is acceptable and do not foresee the proposed development to have a significant impact on the safety and operation of the highway network. Notwithstanding this, in the event of a grant of planning permission a construction management plan would be reasonable to condition in order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way.</p>
<p>Landscaping Issues</p>	<p>District Plan Policies R17 and D8 require the retention of landscape features such as trees and hedges and outline that this type of development should include landscaping as an integral part of the overall design. Policy SADM16 of the Emerging Local Plan explains that proposals will be expected to help conserve and enhance the borough's natural historic landscape and sit comfortably within the wider landscape setting. Furthermore, the NPPF, paragraph 127 requires new developments to ensure appropriate and effective landscaping, sympathetic to the surrounding built environment and landscaping setting.</p>

	<p>Landscaping is of particular importance in the Garden City, with the 'Arcadian' landscape context with mature trees, hedgerows and planting contributing to the significance of the area. This is prevalent on the site and the locality in general. The site is characterised by front and side boundary hedges with a large front, side and rear garden. There is a mature oak tree to the front of the site and additional mature trees border the rear. The existing soft landscaping contributes to the appearance of the site and this part of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site joins a public footpath both to the side and rear and is therefore largely exposed from public vantage points. The public footpath is extensively used by local residents to access Sherrardspark Wood and as a cut through from the residential houses behind the site to the Town Centre. It was previously identified that the introduction of the amount of hard surface alongside this footpath, combined with the introduction of parked cars would introduce a harsh appearance to the site which would be out of keeping with the verdant character of this area.</p> <p>In the current submission, the applicant has reduced the opening of the hedgerow from 4.8m to 3m, and proposed the planting of a native species hedgerow alongside the proposed driveway. Three additional trees are also proposed to help increase the soft landscaping on site. Whilst the current scheme has reduced the amount of hardstanding being proposed compared to the previous refusal, this is limited only to the removal of the 4th parking space and the pedestrian accesses to the proposed dwelling and No. 54. Although this is an improvement over the previous refused scheme, the development would still result in a significant amount of hard surfacing being proposed on site which is visible from the adjacent footpath and Conservation Area. Therefore this would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area, contrary to Policies D1, D8 and R17 of the District Plan; Policies SP9, SADM15 and SADM16 of the Emerging Local Plan and the NPPF. It is important to note that the Estate management policies referred to by the applicant is not a material planning consideration to the assessment of this application.</p>
<p>Any other considerations</p>	<p><i>Refuse and Recycling</i></p> <p>The proliferation of bins can create a considerable amount clutter which in turn has a harmful impact upon the visual amenity of the streetscene and the character of the area contrary to Local Policies D1 and D2. Given the location of the bin storage, it is not considered to result in harm to the residential amenity of adjoining and future occupiers. The Council's Client Services team have been consulted and they considered that the development can be incorporated into the Council's existing Alternate Refuse and Recycling Scheme. Furthermore, the location are considered to be of suitable drag distance from the highway for bin collection.</p> <p><i>Impact to Trees</i></p> <p>There are couple of large oak trees at 52 and 54 Bridge Road. Both are important trees with significant public amenity value. They are both protected by a TPO 842 (2018). The new proposal is showing the access closest to mature Oak Tree (T1), well within the RPA of this tree. The tree Officer has raised concerns that there has already been some disruption to the RPA of T10 from some works to the access to the side of No. 52 approved under</p>

N6/2014/2504/FP and this application will affect the RPA of T1. The applicant has supplied a Arboricultural Impact Plan which goes some way to minimising the impact on the on T1, but further detailed would be required to ensure the tree is retained successfully. If approved a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) would be required as a condition prior to any on site activity. The AMS should not only look at the construction of the access but also storage of building materials and working methods on site.

Ecology

This application site is located within a typical suburban area which is characterised by large gardens with trees. The application site adjoins Dismantled Railway E. of Sherrardspark Wood Local Wildlife Site (LWS). This connects it to the nearby Sherrardspark Woods which has a number of designations: Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Ancient Woodland Inventory site (AWI). These features provide potential foraging roosting and commuting habitat for bats.

A PEA has been submitted and concludes that no potential roost would be affected. It is advisable that a bird and bat box are incorporated into each of the buildings to ensure additional biodiversity gain. Furthermore, in line with the PEA it would be reasonable in the event of a grant of permission to condition the recommendations that set out a Method Statement to mitigate potential harm to protected species.

Contaminated land

Public Health and Protection had previously advised that there may be residual contamination in surrounding areas and information on the site is not available. On this basis in the event of a grant of permission it would be reasonable to attach a contaminated land condition to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with local and national planning policy.

Conclusion

Having regard to the above, the proposed development for a 4 bedroom detached dwelling would represent an unduly cramped and over intensive form of development on the site, poorly related to the established special character and form of this part of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposal fails to maintain the landscaped greenery of the site failing to retain the appearance and ethos of the Garden City. Whilst this would result in less than substantial harm, in line with paragraph 196 of the NPPF the public benefits identified are not considered to outweigh the harm identified. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies D1, D2, D8 and R17 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; Policies SP9, SADM15 and SADM16 of the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016; and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would represent an unduly cramped and over intensive from of development on the site, poorly related to the established special character and form of this part of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposal fails to maintain the landscaped greenery of the site failing to retain the appearance and ethos of the Garden City. Whilst this would result in less than substantial harm, in line with paragraph 196 of the NPPF the public benefits identified are not considered to outweigh the harm identified. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Policies D1, D2, D8 and R17 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005; the Supplementary Design Guidance 2005; Policies SP9, SADM15 and SADM16 of the Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council Local Plan Proposed Submission August 2016; and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
IND-754-LP01		Location Plan	27 July 2020
IND-754-E01		Existing Site Plan	27 July 2020
IND-754-P01		Proposed Site Plan	27 July 2020
IND-754-P02		Proposed Floor Plan	27 July 2020
IND-754-P03		Proposed Elevations	27 July 2020
IND-754-P20		Proposed Access Cross Section	27 July 2020

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 William Myers

21 September 2020