

**WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL – DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**  
**DELEGATED REPORT**

<b>APPLICATION No:</b>	<b>W6/2012/1173/EM</b>
<b>APPLICATION Site:</b>	<b>2 REDDINGS, WELWYN GARDEN CITY</b>

**NOTATION:**

The site lies within the Garden City as designated in the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005.

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:**

The application property comprises of a two storey detached dwelling which is located on the corner of Reddings with Roundwood Drive.

The property is set back from the highway with an open grass frontage. To the side of the property there is a driveway which provides access to a flat roof single garage to the rear of the dwelling.

The property is finished in a red facing brick below a gable ended plain tile roof. To the front of the property there are 2 first floor flat roof dormers. At ground floor level there is a flat roof bay window to the front and side.

The main private garden area is located to the side, and is screened in part by a front boundary hedge.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

The application seeks full planning permission for a two storey rear extension following the demolition of an existing flat roof utility room.

The proposed ground floor accommodation would provide for a new study and utility room.

At first floor level a new bedroom and bathroom are proposed.

The design of the extension would require the existing rear dormer window to be modified so that it becomes a small dormer to serve the existing first floor landing.

The proposed extension would be finished in brickwork and tiling to match the existing. The proposed dormers are to be clad in lead to match the existing.

### **PLANNING HISTORY:**

N6/2012/584/PA - Erection of first floor rear extension – advice given on 18.04.12 which concluded:

*'In conclusion, I have concerns with the proposed development and consider that, together with previous permissions granted at the site, would not be subservient to the original dwelling and would reduce the spaciousness and verdant character of the street scene which would not conserve this part of the Central Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area. In addition, the proposal would not maintain a satisfactory relationship with the adjoining dwelling, No. 23 Roundwood Drive. Furthermore, I also consider that the proposal would be detrimental to the values and amenities of the Estate Management Scheme. Consequently if an application was submitted, it would be unlikely to receive an officer's favourable recommendation for planning permission or estate management consent.'*

W6/2011/2381/EM Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension to include dormer window to front elevation – granted 12/12/2011

W6/2008/2493/EM - Erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions and insertion of dormer window – granted 17/02/2009

### **SUMMARY OF POLICIES:**

1967 Leasehold Reform Act – Estate Management Scheme

Estate Management Scheme Policies October 2008:

EM1 – Extensions and alterations

### **CONSULTATIONS:**

**Hertfordshire County Council (Transport Programmes and Strategy)** – do not wish to restrict the grant of permission.

**TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** None

### **REPRESENTATIONS:**

None

Period expired 19.07.12

**DISCUSSION:** The main issues are:

- 1. The impact of the development on the character and appearance of the application site and the Conservation Area, and the impact on the amenity and values of the Garden City.**
- 2. The impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents**
- 3. Other Material Planning Considerations**

1. The proposed single storey rear extension would be sited to the rear of the existing garage and the rear elevation of the extension would be set back by a minimum of 1 metre from the northern boundary shared with neighbours at 23 Roundwood Drive.

Part of this single storey extension will have a flat roof, encased by a parapet wall, and will be constructed of matching facing brickwork. This single storey extension would be widely screened from the surrounding area. It would also occupy a location of an extension already approved by application. As such this part of the proposal is considered to be of a scale, design and siting that would have no material impact on the character and appearance of the area and would be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling.

The first floor element of the proposal would be sited in a more prominent location when seen for the streetscene. A smaller extension at first floor level was considered previously by application W6/2011/2381/EM.

In this previous application of W6/2011/2381/EM it was noted that the first floor extension, although in a prominent location, was of a form and fenestration that would respect the parent dwelling as the gable would be set in from the front and rear elevation and subsequently the ridge and eave height would be lower. Accordingly it is considered that the proposal would be subordinate in scale and the proposal would sufficiently preserve the character of this dwelling.

The first floor element of the proposal is sited in a more prominent location when seen for the streetscene. A first floor extension at first floor level was considered previously by application W6/2011/2381/EM.

In this previous application of W6/2011/2381/EM it was noted that the first floor extension, although in a prominent location, was of a form and fenestration that would respect the parent dwelling.

In this application, however, the proposed extension is larger, being wider and also higher than that previously approved.

Notwithstanding these design changes the current proposal is still considered to be in a form and fenestration that would respect the parent dwelling in its architectural detailing, and may even be an improvement compared to the previously approved design with the addition of dormers.

This part of the proposal when viewed from the streetscene would also still be considered to appear subordinate in scale to that of the parent dwelling. Although the

visual gap between the application property and No.23 would be reduced further than the previous approval, this difference would not be significantly different.

In this case and location, the proposed gap between dwellings in this location is considered to be sufficient. It is considered overall that the proposal would therefore still maintain the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the scale of the first floor side extension would also appear subordinate in scale to the parent dwelling.

The proposal, would fail to sufficiently maintain the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area and the amenities and values of Welwyn Garden City in accordance with policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

2. The two storey extension would be positioned to be approximately 1 metre from the dwelling of 23 Roundwood Drive. 23 Roundwood Drive is located to the north of the application site, and is set further forward, so that the proposed first floor extension will be adjacent to the outside garden area directly behind this neighbouring property. Even though there is a limited degree of separation between the common boundary and the proposal, it is considered the development would not result in the extension appearing either over dominant and overbearing when viewed from this neighbour's rear garden. There would be some degree of overshadowing, although not to an extent which would have an unreasonable impact on the light that is afforded to the neighbouring residents.

Overall the proposal is considered not to harm the residential amenity of neighbours and so fails to comply with EM1.

### **3. Material Planning Considerations**

**Protected Species** The presence of protected species is a material consideration, in accordance with the National Planning Policy, Natural Environment & Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 (section 40), Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as well as Circular 06/05.

Protected species such as great crested newts, otters, dormice and bats benefit from the strictest legal protection. These species are known as European Protected Species ('EPS') and the protection afforded to them derives from the EU Habitats Directive, in addition to the above legislation. Water voles, badgers, reptiles, all wild birds, invertebrates and certain rare plants are protected to a lesser extent under UK domestic law (NERC Act and Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981).

The existing site and development is such that there is not a reasonable likelihood of EPS being present on site nor would a EPS offence be likely to occur. It is therefore not necessary to consider the Conservation Regulations 2010 further.

### **CONCLUSION:**

The proposal complies with Policy EM1 as the extensions will preserve the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

This proposal meets the high quality design and residential amenity requirements which is expected in Garden City

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL AND CONDITIONS**

1-5. EM01a

6. C.13.1: The development/works shall not be started and completed other than in accordance with drawings AT397-04 & AT397-02 received and dated 01 June 2012

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 – To Match Existing

**SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE GRANT OF PERMISSION:**

It is considered that the proposed development would not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the residential amenity or the character of the area in which it would be located. It would therefore be in compliance with the Estate Management Scheme.

**INFORMATIVES:**

None

**Signature of author..... Date.....**