

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

## **DELEGATED APPLICATION**

Application No:	6/2021/3101/EM
Location:	65 Lemsford Lane Welwyn Garden City AL8 6YN
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey side/rear extension with raised decking area following demolition of existing single storey side extension
Officer:	Mr James Homer

Recommendation: Granted

6/2021/3101/EM

Context					
Site and Application description	No.65 is a two storey semi-detached property located upon the south western side of Lemsford Lane. The property benefits from an existing side/rear extension and a deep rear garden.				
	The application seeks Estate Management Scheme consent to demolish the existing extension and erect a replacement side and rear extension.				
	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 photographs and plans submitted by the applicant.				
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967				
Relevant history	1967Application Number: 6/2022/0022/EMDecision:Decision Date:Proposal: Widening of existing hardstandingApplication Number: W6/2012/2525/EMDecision: GrantedDecisionDate: 20 February 2013Proposal: Loft conversion comprising of two rear Velux roof windowsApplication Number: W6/2013/1062/EMDecision: GrantedDecisionDate: 22 July 2013Proposal: Formation of hardstanding to front garden, works to include removalof hedgeApplication Number: 6/2021/3099/HOUSEDecision: GrantedDecisionDate: 29 December 2021Proposal: Erection of a single storey side/rear extension with raised decking area involving demolition of existing single storey side extension				
Notifications	1				
Neighbour representations		her: 0			
Summary of	No comments received.				

neighbour					
responses Consultee	No comments received.				
responses					
Relevant Policies					
EM1 EM2 Cothers					
Considerations					
Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (impact upon amenities and values of Garden City)	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.				
	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.				
	Side extension design and detailing should be consistent with the character of the original property. Materials, scale, proportions and detailing, including fenestration should be mirrored from the existing property within the proposed extension. The design of the side extension must be subservient to and in proportion with the existing house and plot.				
	The proposed rear extension would have a depth of approximately 4m and would cover the majority of the rear elevation of the existing house (leaving a gap of approx. 0.7m between the flank wall and the shared boundary with no.63). The rear extension would feature a flat roof with a single roof light tucked in close to the original building and not visible from public areas. The rear extension would adjoin the proposed side extension upon the detached side.				
	Following demolition of the existing side extension the application proposes to erect a larger replacement. The proposed side extension would extend to the same depth into the rear garden and, unlike the existing, would infill the area between the main house and the property boundary with an in-step at the front of approx. 0.25m. The side extension would feature flat roofing that would tie into the rear extension proposed above. The side extension will result in the relocation of the main door from the side of the existing house to the front elevation of the side extension. The proposed design of the front door is considered acceptable. In addition, a small window is also proposed for the front facing elevation of the extension, however, the window would match the existing frames within the house and no objection is raised in this regard.				
	The proposed extensions add considerably to the ground floor of the existing home. However, from the front only the front elevation of a relatively narrow side extension would be visible resulting in minimal impact to the property and street scene when viewed from public areas. The majority of the additions are to the rear of the property and although the side extension extends approx. 8.5m into the rear garden, it is no deeper than the existing structure. It is not clear when the existing side extension was built and it may predate the introduction of the Estate Management Scheme, therefore, could form part of the original building (when assessing EMS applications). It should also be noted that a high brick wall marks the boundary between the application site				

	and neighbouring properties within De Soissons Close. The wall was erected as part of the newer De Soissons Close development (outside of EMS area) and will screen the increase in height proposed for the side extensions. Ordinarily, a proposal of this size would be unlikely to satisfy the requirements of the Estate Management Scheme. However, in this case the established extensions, existing boundary treatments and siting of the application site should be taken into account. From the front, the impact upon the property and street scene is minimal as the side extension would appear subordinate. The majority of the development would not be visible from public spaces with the main increases restricted to the rear garden of the application site. The property has a good sized rear garden and the proposed development would				
	not over dominate the space. Despite the individual circumstances of the application, the proposal is at the limits of what can be considered acceptable under the Estate Management Scheme.				
	No materials have been specified, however, a matching finish can be secured by condition.				
Impact on neighbours	The proposed side extension is the same depth as the existing structure and although higher, would be screened from properties in De Soissons Close by the existing brick wall that forms part of that development.				
	The rear extension would be set in from the shared boundary with no.63 by approx. 0.7m therefore would not result in significant loss of outlook or light.				
	Fenestration within the rear elevation would face into the rear garden of the application site and would not compromise the privacy of neighbouring homes.				
Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)	None.				
Any other	None.				
considerations					
Conclusion					
The individual circumstances of the application site will mean that the additions proposed within this					
application can be considered in keeping with the appearance of the existing building and will not					
have a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the property, the surrounding area or the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers. Although at the limit of what can be considered					
	reasonable the application satisfies the requirements of Policy EM1 of the Estate Management				
Caboma					

# **Conditions:**

Scheme.

1. All works carried out in pursuance of this consent shall be and remain part of the Premises and shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the conveyance in all respects as if such works had at all times formed part of the Premises.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 Estate Management Scheme for Welwyn Garden City.

2. This consent or copy hereof shall be annexed to the Conveyance.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 Estate Management Scheme for Welwyn Garden City.

3. There shall be no encroachment over the boundary of the plot either above or below ground level, nor any interference with the foundations of the adjoining property without the agreement of the adjoining owner or lessee.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 Estate Management Scheme for Welwyn Garden City.

4. This consent now issued is given by the Council only in accordance with the requirements of the Management Scheme/Conveyance or Leasehold Covenants.

REASON: To comply with the requirements of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 Estate Management Scheme for Welwyn Garden City.

5. The brickwork, bonding, mortar, roof tiles, cladding and architectural detailing (including soffits, eaves, external pipe work and guttering) of the approved extension/alterations shall match that used in the existing dwelling.

REASON: To protect the character and appearance of the original building and the amenities of the area in accordance with the requirements of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 Estate Management Scheme for Welwyn Garden City and Policy EM1.

6. Within the front elevation, the external window frames, glazing bars, sills, door, door surrounds and other external decorations associated with the fenestration hereby approved shall not be any colour other than white.

REASON: To protect the character and appearance of the original building and the amenities of the area in accordance with the requirements of the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 Estate Management Scheme for Welwyn Garden City and Policy EM1.

### DRAWING NUMBERS

7. The development/works shall not be started and completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details:

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
5338-OS1		Location Plan	29 October 2021
5338-E01		Existing Plans & Elevations	29 October 2021
5338-P01	С	Proposed Plans & Elevations	10 January 2022
5338-OS2	А	Block Plan	10 January 2022

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details.

#### Determined By:

Mr James Homer 10 January 2022