WELWYN HATFIELD COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION No:	**W6/2011/0018/EM**
APPLICATION Site:	**48 Bridge Road**

DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The character of the immediate area is predominantly residential consisting of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings. These dwellings are predominately red-brick, neo-Georgian. However, 48/50 and 52/54, which form two pairs of semi-detached dwellings, are of a different design. They are white rendered and yellow brick respectively and are of different architectural styles.

The application site is located to the west of the town centre and on the northern side of the highway, directly opposite the junction with Handside Lane. The site measures approximately 56 metres deep and 17 metres wide. It consists of a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with front and rear associated gardens. The dwelling has been subjected to a two storey side extension and a conservatory has been added to the rear.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:
This application seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension. The extension would extend 2.9 metres from the rear of the existing two storey side extension. It would be same width as the ground floor of the existing extension and would have a false hipped roof that would stand to a height of 3.25 metres. It would be finished with white painted cement render and plain clay tiles to match existing.

HISTORY:
W6/2008/2440/EM – Retention of replacement fence to side boundary – Withdrawn

W6/2008/2376/EM - Replacement boundary fence – Invalid

W6/2001/1166/EM - Retention of replacement detached garage – Granted 08/10/2001

W6/1999/5184/EM - Erection of a part single and part first floor side extension – Granted 08/07/1999

W6/1997/5308/EM - Erection of first floor side extension, porch and rear conservatory – Granted 05/01/1998

SUMMARY OF POLICIES:
Estate Management Scheme Policies (October 2008):
EM1 – Extensions and Alterations

CONSULTATIONS
None

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS
None

REPRESENTATIONS
This application has been advertised by neighbour notification letters and no representations have been received. Period expired 4 February 2010.

DISCUSSION:

The main issues are:

1. **Impact on the amenity and values of the Garden City.**
2. **Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.**

1. Impact on the amenity and values of the Garden City

Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme applies and refers to extensions and alterations and seeks to preserve the unique architectural heritage of the town and its building. It states that extensions and alterations to existing buildings 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. In addition, the policy states that extensions or alterations should not materially affect the residential amenities of adjoining residents through loss of day/sun/skylight, loss of privacy and outlook.

On its own the proposed extension is modest in scale and clearly subordinate to the scale of the original dwellinghouse. In contrast, when considered with previous extensions and alterations to the original dwelling, it would result in a significant increase in the mass and bulk of the dwellinghouse. However, the proposal would be sited to the rear of the existing property and only glimpses of the side elevation would be visible in the street scene. Consequently from this perspective the apparent mass and bulk of the existing dwellinghouse would not alter considerably and the visual amenity of this property retained.

The proposal would have a false hipped roof. It would link to the existing lean-to structure on the side of the property and would have the same roof pitch. The detailed design of the extension is proposed to match, along with the materials used. The proposal would therefore sufficiently relate to the form and detail design of the existing dwellinghouse.

It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its siting, scale and design, would maintain the amenity and values of the Garden City in accordance with policy EM1.

2. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

The impact of the proposed development on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings is considered in terms of the impact on neighbouring properties access to day/sun/sky light, overbearing and privacy. Giving consideration to the scale of the proposal, the siting of windows in the adjoining properties and the orientation of the dwellings, it is still considered that the proposed extension would not have an unreasonable impact on the daylight or sunlight afforded to the neighbouring residency or the level of privacy they currently enjoy. It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers in accordance with Policy EM1.

CONCLUSION:
It is considered that the proposal would sufficiently maintain the amenity and values of the Garden City and not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties in accordance with policies EM1.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

CONDITIONS:
1-5. EM01

6. The development/works shall not be started and completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details 728/01 & 959/03 & 959/04 received and dated 11 January 2011.

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and any changes must be agreed in advance in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

7. EM03

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE GRANT OF PERMISSION:
It is considered that the proposed development does not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the residential amenity or the character of the area in which it is located. It is therefore in compliance with the Estate Management Scheme.

INFORMATIVES:
None

Signature of author…… Date……..