

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/1179/EM
Location: 25 Rooks Hill Welwyn Garden City AL8 6EU
Proposal: Erection of rear single-storey extension with roof lights in order to create extended family/kitchen area with utility and associated works.
Officer: Mr James Homer

Recommendation: Refused

6/2021/1179/EM

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>No.25 is a two storey semi-detached property located upon the northern side of Rooks Hill.</p> <p>The application seeks Estate Management Scheme consent to erect a single storey rear extension.</p> <p>Please note that due to the restrictions in place as a result of the Coronavirus pandemic, no site visit was made to the rear garden. However, the case officer was satisfied that the application could be assessed from observations made from areas to the side and rear of the property and by using the plans submitted by the applicant.</p>		
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
Relevant history	<p>Application Number: 6/2021/1167/HOUSE Decision: Granted Decision Date: 15 June 2021 Proposal: Erection of rear single-storey extension with roof lights in order to create extended family/kitchen area with utility and associated works.</p>		
Notifications			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Summary of neighbour responses	No comments received.		
Consultee responses	No comments received.		
Relevant Policies			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM1 <input type="checkbox"/> EM2 <input type="checkbox"/> EM3 Others			
Considerations			
Design (form, size, scale, siting)	Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme states that extensions and alterations to existing properties will only be allowed if they are in keeping with		

<p>and Character (impact upon amenities and values of Garden City)</p>	<p>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 amenity of adjoining occupiers.</p> <p>Rear extensions should complement the character and style of the original home through the matching of materials, scale, fenestration, proportions and architectural detailing. Designed to accommodate a flat roof system, the overall scale of a rear extension should be proportionate and adequately subordinate to the original property and should not over dominate rear gardens.</p> <p>The proposed extension would have an approximate depth of 3m and would extend across the full width of the rear of the property. A window unit and pair of doors are proposed for the rear elevation. In terms of scale, the proposed extension would appear proportionate to the existing building and would not over dominate the rear garden.</p> <p>However, the extension has been designed with a pitched roof which is contrary to the design guidance for properties within the Estate Management Scheme area. Single storey rear extensions are expected to accommodate a flat roof system to help maintain a feeling of openness within the Estate Management Scheme area and minimise the disruption to the design of the original building.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>It is not considered that the proposed development being single storey, with a depth of approximately 3m, would result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of light, appearing unduly dominant or result in an impact on privacy.</p>
<p>Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Any other considerations</p>	<p>None.</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	
<p>Although the depth and width of the proposed extension may be considered acceptable, the mono pitched roof is contrary to Estate Management Scheme guidance. Single storey rear extensions are expected to accommodate a flat roof system to help maintain a feeling of openness within the Estate Management Scheme area and minimise the disruption to the design of the original building. As a result, the application fails to comply with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.</p>	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. Although the depth and width of the proposed extension may be considered acceptable, the mono pitched roof is contrary to Estate Management Scheme guidance. Single storey rear extensions are expected to accommodate a flat roof system to help maintain a feeling of openness within the Estate Management Scheme area and minimise the disruption to the design of the original building. As a result, the application fails to comply with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
01		Existing floor and elevation plans	12 April 2021
200	A	Proposed floor and elevation plans	12 May 2021

Determined By:

Mr James Homer
7 July 2021