

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2022/2450/EM
Location: 16 Walden Road Welwyn Garden City AL8 7PF
Proposal: Part single storey and part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, Velux loft conversion, alterations to openings, patio area with balustrading and addition of solar panels to existing and proposed roofs.
Officer: Mr James Homer

Recommendation: Refused

6/2022/2450/EM

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>No.16 is a two-storey end of terrace property located upon the southern side of Walden Road. No.16 is a bookend property (mirrored by no.10 at the opposite end of the terrace) and is set slightly forward and with a higher roof than the attached property at no.14.</p> <p>16 Walden Road sits behind the front build line of 18 Walden Road and there is a large separation gap which contains a shared single storey garage. 18 Walden Road sits significantly lower and therefore all elevations of 16 Walden Road are prominent and visible to the public realm.</p> <p>16 Walden Road has a large driveway with vehicular access from Walden Road to its garage. The front driveway and garden maintain a large set back from the road edge. The property also had a medium sized garden which is well landscaped and contains small trees.</p> <p>The application seeks Estate Management Scheme consent to erect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a part single storey, part two storey rear extension, - a single storey side extension, - construct a patio with balustrades and steps, - construct of a ramp, - make alterations to the first-floor side and rear windows, - convert the loft into habitable accommodation with installation of rooflights, and - install solar panels on the existing and proposed roofs. 		
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
Relevant history	Application Number: 6/2019/1858/EM Date: 01 October 2019 Proposal: Alterations to fenestration	Decision: Granted	Decision
	Application Number: 6/2022/1562/EM Date: 15 August 2022 Proposal: Proposal to block pave & widen the existing driveway to incorporate an existing footpath and area of lawn.	Decision: Granted	Decision

	Application Number: 6/2022/2468/HOUSE Decision: Refused Decision Date: 09 December 2022 Proposal: Part single storey and part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension, Velux loft conversion, alterations to openings, patio area with balustrading and addition of solar panels to existing and proposed roofs.		
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 <input type="checkbox"/> EM4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM5			
Considerations			
Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (impact upon amenities and values of Garden City)	<p>Extensions and alterations to an existing property is covered by Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme which 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>Within the Estate Management Scheme area, 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 near their neighbour or where they may appear overly dominant. 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 erect a part single, part two storey rear extension. At ground floor, the extension would have an approximate depth of 3.7m, and where single storey, would include a flat roof with roof light. The first-floor element would also have a depth of approx. 3.7m and would include a gable end design that would be set down from the ridge of the main house. The proposed plans indicate that the first-floor extension would conflict with an existing rear dormer and it is not clear how the existing roof would adjoin the extension, given that the eaves of the main roof are considerably lower.</p> <p>The ground floor element of the rear extension would adjoin a single storey side extension that would run along the side of the rear extension and partially along the side of the main house to the main entrance. The extension would feature a flat roof and openings that would match the style of the existing house.</p> <p>Although set down and no deeper than 3.7m, the proposed rear extension and proposed side extension would not appear subordinate or proportionate in scale or appearance to the original home and associated garage resulting in a</p>		

	<p>cramped and overly dominant addition. This dominant appearance is exacerbated due to the raised patio area, change in topography across the application site (drop in levels at the rear of the house), its elevated position in relation to no.18 and the wide visibility of the side of the property from the street.</p> <p>The application also proposes to convert the loft into habitable space by inserting a porthole window within the gable end of the main house and inserting a roof light in the rear facing roof slope. These additions are not considered to result in harm to the appearance of the property or character of the wider street scene.</p> <p>Alterations to window openings within the flank gable of the existing home are proposed to enable internal modifications. The proposed alterations are considered in keeping with the appearance of the property and would not harm the character of the area.</p> <p>Finally, the application proposes to install a solar array upon the rear roof slope of the existing home and an array on each side of the roof of proposed first floor extension. Within the Estate Management Scheme area, solar panels should be arranged in a rectangular form, to avoid fragmentation and varying edges, and should be set suitably down from ridges and in from sides. In addition, when visible, panels should be concentrated to one roof plane only with multiple installations avoided.</p> <p>Despite the multiple installation proposal, this element of the scheme may be acceptable as they are generally rear facing. However, it is recommended that the solar array for the rear facing roof slope is set down and in so that it is sited more comfortably within the roof slope.</p>
Impact on neighbours	<p>The new windows would either maintain existing views over the neighbouring properties and gardens or serve non-habitable spaces therefore, the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy or result in overlooking.</p> <p>All other aspects of the proposed development regarding its relationship to neighbouring properties are considered acceptable and are unlikely to result in a significant impact on a loss of daylight or sunlight.</p>
Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)	<p>An application for landscaping work within the front of the property was approved in August 2022.</p>
Any other considerations	<p>None.</p>
Conclusion	
<p>Although elements of the proposal may be considered acceptable, the proposed rear extension and proposed side extension would not appear subordinate or proportionate in scale or appearance to the original home and associated garage resulting in cramped and overly dominant additions. This dominant appearance is exacerbated due to the raised patio area, change in topography across the application site (drop in levels at the rear of the house), its elevated position in relation to no.18 and the wide visibility of the side of the property from the street. Accordingly, the application fails to comply with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.</p>	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. Although elements of the proposal may be considered acceptable, the proposed rear extension and proposed side extension would not appear subordinate or proportionate in scale or appearance to the original home and associated garage resulting in cramped and overly dominant additions. This dominant appearance is exacerbated due to the raised patio area, change in topography across the application site (drop in levels at the rear of the house), its elevated position in relation to no.18 and the wide visibility of the side of the property from the street. Accordingly, the application fails to comply with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
5592-E01		Plans & elevations as existing	24 October 2022
5592-OS1		Location plan	24 October 2022
5592-P01	B	Proposed plans & elevations	24 October 2022
5592-OS2	A	Block plan	8 November 2022

Determined By:

Mr James Homer
20 December 2022