

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/0452/EM
Location: 22 Stanborough Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 6XD
Proposal: Erection of first floor side extension and insertion of port hole window to existing front elevation
Officer: Mrs S Smith

Recommendation: Refused

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is the end terrace in a row of six properties. This row of properties face towards the junction with Parkway and Stanborough Road, although they are set back from the junction and have an area of grass and turning head to the front. The side of the property is visible when travelling along Stanborough Road.</p> <p>This application seeks consent for the erection of a first floor side extension. Whilst it would form a bedroom, the internal layout of the existing house would be altered and the number of bedrooms at the property would not exist from the current situation. Materials would match the existing. Additionally a first floor window is proposed to the front elevation of the dwelling.</p>		
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
Relevant history	<p>Application Number: W6/2009/1633/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 12 October 2009 Proposal: Proposed extension to outhouse</p> <p>Application Number: W6/2010/2020/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 10 November 2010 Proposal: Alterations to window and door layout</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Consultee responses	<p>1. Councillor Helen Bromley - no response</p> <p>2. Councillor Fiona Thomson - no response</p> <p>3. Councillor Rachel Basch - no response</p>		
Relevant Policies			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM1 <input type="checkbox"/> EM2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM3 Others			
Considerations			
Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character	The proposed extension would be a first floor extension to the side of the property. The proposed additional floor space together with the existing additional floor space would not overwhelm the original dwelling and the		

(impact upon amenities and values of Garden City)	<p>extension would be set down from the ridge of the roof of the property. As a result it would be considered to be subordinate to the overall size and scale of the original dwelling. However, it is to the side of the property where it has not been set back from the front elevation. As a result it would be viewed as a continuation of the existing terrace row appearing as an 'add' on and incongruous addition, disrupting the appearance of the application property and the view of the terrace from the front. This would be emphasised by its set down from the ridge of the roof of the property failing to appear as a continuation to the row of terrace dwellings. Additionally, its detailed design would be a blank wall with no fenestration which would not provide any benefits to this scheme.</p> <p>The space to the side of the property that would be maintained would be acceptable. However this does not overcome the harm identified above.</p> <p>The proposed window to the front elevation of the main dwelling would reflect the design of the existing ground floor porthole window and no objections are raised with this element of the proposal.</p> <p>Accordingly the proposed development is poor design that would not respect or relate to the character and appearance of the area. As a result it would fail to maintain and enhance the values and amenities of the Garden City contrary to EM1.</p>
Impact on neighbours	Given the location of the proposed extension, it would cause no undue impact to any neighbouring property.
Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)	Trees are to the front of the property and it is considered that in the event of an approval, conditions would be required to ensure that these trees are adequately protected throughout the construction.
Any other considerations	None
Conclusion	
The proposed extension would fail to maintain the values and amenities of the Garden City contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. By virtue of the location, design and appearance of the proposed extension it would appear as an incongruous addition to the application property and to the row of terrace dwellings. The proposal therefore represents poor quality design which would fail to maintain the values and amenities of the Garden City contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
4046-OS2		Block Plan	7 March 2017
4046-P01		Plans & Elevations as Proposed	7 March 2017
4046-E01		Plans & Elevations as Existing	7 March 2017
4046-OS1		Site Location Plan	7 March 2017

Determined By: Mrs L Hughes 26 April 2017