

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2021/1771/EM
Location: 22 Rooks Hill Welwyn Garden City AL8 6ET
Proposal: Garage conversion and erection of first floor extension.
Officer: Mr James Homer

Recommendation: Refused

6/2021/1771/EM

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>No.22 is a two storey semi-detached house located upon the southern side of Rooks Hill. The property includes a detached flat roof garage to the side that is set to the rear of a deep driveway. The property is a typical example of the houses within Rooks Hill with garages sitting between the semi-detached homes.</p> <p>The application seeks Estate Management Scheme consent to demolish the existing garage, erect a part single, part two storey rear extension and, make alterations to an existing 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. However, the case officer was satisfied that the application could be assessed using the plans submitted by the applicant an from observations made from the street.</p>		
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
Relevant history	<p>Application Number: 6/2012/1272/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 28/06/2012 Proposal: Removal of external front door and replacement of garage door.</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2011/0367/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 28/04/2011 Proposal: Erection of single storey extension and extension to garage</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2021/1527/HOUSE Decision: Refused Decision Date: 02 September 2021 Proposal: Erection of part two-storey extension to rear with a garage conversion.</p>		
Notifications			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Summary of neighbour responses	No comments received.		

Consultee responses	No comment received.
Relevant Policies	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM1 <input type="checkbox"/> EM2 <input type="checkbox"/> EM3 Others	
Considerations	
Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (impact upon amenities and values of Garden City)	<p>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 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. The overall scale of a rear extension should be proportionate and adequately subordinate to the original property and should not over dominate rear gardens. In addition, two storey extensions require greater levels of sensitivity to take into regard the proximity of neighbouring properties. As a result, an offset of up to 3.7m from the rear of the original building line may be acceptable, although lesser depths may be required for properties in close proximity to their neighbours. Upper floor roof pitches should be consistent with the original design of the property where the extended roof is designed to merge with the existing roof structure.</p> <p>The application proposes to demolish the existing detached garage and erect a single storey rear/side extension that would utilise the space left by the garage and adjoin an existing rear extension. As a result the rear extension would extend approx. 8m from the rear of the original home, however, the extension would be no deeper than the rear wall of the existing garage. The extension would overlap the detached flank of the original home by approx. 1.7m resulting in a front facing wall with a single window and a gap between the extension and the shared boundary with no.20 to allow rear access. Whilst the principle of converting the garage and its linking to the main house may be acceptable, in this instance the proposed side extension will see the harmful alteration of the street scene through the loss of the existing flat roof garage which is a characteristic feature of this row of semi-detached properties and will result in noticeable gap in the built form that breaks the symmetry currently seen. Whilst the garages of Nos. 22 and 26 are not physically attached or uniform in appearance, they largely follow the established pattern of the neighbouring properties and this is reflective of the original layout of Rooks Hill.</p> <p>The application also proposes the erection of a first floor extension. With a hipped roof the first floor extension would have depth of approximately 3.7m and would be set down from the main ridge by approx. 0.6m. As a result, the first floor extension would appear adequately subordinate to the main home.</p> <p>As a result of the proposed extensions the existing home will be altered to include a set of bi-folding doors within the ground floor rear elevation and the addition of a single roof light within the remaining flat roof of the existing rear extension.</p> <p>Although the proposed extensions would remain proportionate and subordinate to the original home and would reflect the constraints of the existing built form, the loss of the garage to allow the erection of the side/rear extension and subsequent impact upon the property and wider street scene is</p>

	considered harmful to the character of the home and street scene.
Impact on neighbours	The proposed single storey rear/side extension would include a window and door within the flank elevation, however, these would look to the side wall of the neighbouring garage at no.20. A small window, to serve an en-suite bathroom, is also proposed for the side elevation of the first floor extension which faces toward no.22. No detail is given for this window therefore a condition to ensure obscure glazing and non-opening below 1.7m can be included if necessary. All other windows face the rear garden and would offer views similar to those from existing windows. The therefore, proposed extensions are unlikely to result in a harmful loss of light, outlook or privacy to neighbouring homes.
Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)	None.
Any other considerations	None.
Conclusion	
Although the proposed extensions would remain proportionate and subordinate to the original home and would reflect the constraints of the existing built form, the garage is considered to be a characteristic feature of the street scene and will result in a break in the symmetry currently seen within the semis of Rooks Hill. The loss of the garage to allow the erection of the side/rear extension and subsequent impact upon the property and wider street scene is considered harmful to the character of the home and street scene. As a result, the application fails to comply with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. Although the proposed extensions would remain proportionate and subordinate to the original home and would reflect the constraints of the existing built form with regard to depth into the garden, the garage is considered to be a characteristic feature of the street scene and will result in a break in the symmetry currently seen within the semis of Rooks Hill. The loss of the garage to allow the erection of the side/rear extension and subsequent impact upon the property and wider street scene is considered harmful to the character of the home and street scene. 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
FP.09.03.21		Site And Location Plan	17 May 2021
FP.01.03.21		Existing ground floor	17 May 2021
FP.02.03.21		Existing first floor	17 May 2021
FP.03.03.21		Existing roof	17 May 2021
FP.04.03.21		Existing elevations	17 May 2021
FP.05.03.21		Proposed ground floor	17 May 2021

FP.06.03.21	Proposed first floor	17 May 2021
FP.07.03.21	Proposed roof	17 May 2021
FP.08.03.21	Proposed elevations	17 May 2021

Determined By:

Mr James Homer
7 September 2021