

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
DELEGATED REPORT**

APPLICATION No:	W6/2012/1852/EM
APPLICATION Site:	177 Parkway, Welwyn Garden City

DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

The site is a two storey terraced dwelling house bounded to the north and south by adjoining properties and their rear gardens, by rear gardens to the east and by the street to the west.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:

The proposal seeks the erection of a single storey extension on the south-east side of the rear elevation measuring approximately 3.5m wide and 4m deep. It would feature no windows on the southern side elevation. The southern side elevation would be set back approximately 150mm from the building/boundary line of the main dwelling house. The northern side elevation would be bound by an existing single storey projecting rear extension of the property which forms the northern boundary of the site and extends approximately 1.8m beyond the rear building line of the proposed extension and 6m from the main rear elevation of the property. The extension would feature a flat roof with a glazed roof light and red facing brick to match that of the original dwelling house.

ESTATE MANAGEMENT HISTORY:

W6/2012/0766/EM - Erection of single storey rear extension – Refused 09/07/2012

W6/2010/1276/EM - Formation of Vehicle Hardstanding and Crossover - Approved 15/09/2010

W6/2003/0817/EM - Alterations to outbuilding – Approved 21/07/2003

SUMMARY OF POLICIES:

1967 Leasehold Reforms Act – Estate Management Scheme:
Estate Management Scheme Policies October 2008:
EM1 – Extensions and alterations

CONSULTATIONS: None

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS: None

REPRESENTATIONS:

None, period expired

DISCUSSION:

The main issues are:

- 1. Whether the proposal accords with the Policy EM1; and**
- 2. Other Material Planning Considerations**

1. The character and appearance of much of Welwyn Garden City has a quality that consists of carefully designed layouts with formal and symmetrical patterns where the design and detailing of architecture is in groups and individual buildings. Therefore in order to preserve the unique architectural heritage of the town and its building the Council expects that all applications for extensions and alterations respect and do not harm the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme applies and refers to extensions and alterations and seeks to preserve the unique architectural heritage of the town and its buildings. It states that extensions and alterations to existing buildings will only be allowed if they are in keeping with the design, appearance, materials and architectural detailing used in the existing building and do not have a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the surrounding area or the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers. In addition, the policy states that extensions or alterations should not materially affect the residential amenities of adjoining residents through loss of day/sun/skylight, loss of privacy and outlook.

Application ref. W6/2012/0766/EM which was refused permission proposed an extension approximately 6m in depth, matching the depth of the existing rear projecting side extension on the site, compared to a depth of 4m as proposed in this application. At 6m deep, that proposal was not considered subordinate in scale to the original dwelling house and was considered to stand out amongst the surrounding back gardens as an unduly bulky and alien feature when viewed from nearby properties.

The proposed extension would be located to the rear of the property. As the property is a mid-terrace dwelling, the proposal would not be readily discernible from the street scene of Parkway. The proposal would feature facing brick to match that of the main dwelling. Its limited depth at 4m, which would form the predominant rear elevation compared to the existing 2.3m wide side extension which extends to 6m in depth from the rear of the house, its height at approximately 2.8m, and single storey nature are considered to enable the proposal to remain subordinate to the main two storey dwelling house and not result in undue bulk to the rear of the property. In addition to these characteristics, the external treatment and 'infill' nature of the extension, with its primary rear elevation set back approximately 2m before the rear elevation of the existing 6m deep rear projecting side extension, are considered to enable the proposal to remain in keeping with the design, appearance, materials and architectural detailing of the existing building, whilst not accentuating the depth of the

existing side extension or appearing overbearing in relation to the size of the dwelling house and plot.

Giving consideration to the scale of the proposal at single storey in height, its siting to the rear of the property which would only be visible from the rear elevations, its positioning on one side of an existing rear projecting element of the property which extends further than the rear elevation of the proposed extension, the siting of rear windows in the adjoining properties behind the boundary treatment at ground level and the height of the proposal which would not exceed that of the existing rear projection when viewed from the rear first floor windows of either adjoining property, and its limited depth at approximately 4m, it is considered that the proposed extension would not have an unreasonable impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of adjacent dwellings with regard to access to day/sun/sky light, causing an overbearing effect or loss of outlook, and in terms of overlooking/privacy.

Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to detrimentally impact upon the character, amenities or values of the surrounding area, and is considered to comply with policy EM1.

2. The presence of protected species is a material consideration, in accordance with the National Planning Policy, Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (section 40), Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as well as Circular 06/05. Protected species such as great crested newts, otters, dormice and bats benefit from the strictest legal protection. These species are known as European Protected Species ('EPS') and the protection afforded to them derives from the EU Habitats Directive, in addition to the above legislation. Water voles, badgers, reptiles, all wild birds, invertebrates and certain rare plants are protected to a lesser extent under UK domestic law (NERC Act and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981). The existing site and development is such that there is not a reasonable likelihood of EPS being present on site nor would a EPS offence be likely to occur. It is therefore not necessary to consider the Conservation Regulations 2010 and amended 2012 Regulations further.

CONCLUSION: The proposal would be in keeping with the visual appearance and character of the property and the surrounding area and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining properties and therefore complies with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme. In addition, there is not a reasonable likelihood of protected species being present.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

CONDITIONS:

1. EM01
2. C.13.1 The development/works shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details: A100 titled 'Existing 7 Proposed Plans and Elevations' received and dated 19 September 2012 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and any changes must be agreed in advance in writing by the local planning authority.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE GRANT OF PERMISSION:

It is considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the residential amenity or the character of the area in which it would be located. It would therefore be in compliance with the Estate Management Scheme.

INFORMATIVES:

None

Signature of author..... Date.....