

Application Number: W6/2014/2794/EM

Description of Development: Erection of a double garage following the demolition of existing double garage and erection of single storey rear and side extensions. Raising of polycarbonate roof to breakfast room and internal alterations

Recommendation: Approval subject to conditions

Site Designation: The site lies within the Welwyn Garden City Estate Management Scheme

Relevant history

None

Consultations

Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council – Landscape and Ecology - No objection subject to conditions to require an Arboricultural Method Statement and details of soft landscaping, prior to the commencement of the development. Given the existing condition on the planning application for these works, imposing this condition is not considered necessary on this application in this instance.

Neighbour representations

None received Object Support

Town / Parish representations

None received Object Support

Relevant Policies

EM1 EM2 EM3

Others: None

Main issues

Would the proposal be in keeping with the overall design, appearance, materials and architectural detailing of the existing property?

Yes No N/A

Comment: The existing single storey flat roofed garage is detached from the house and sited forward of it, with its rear elevation linked to the house by a wall of the same scale, running along the same building line as the front elevation of the house. This results in the appearance of a continuous single storey built presence from the street scene of Densley Close. On the opposite side of the house frontage, the existing single storey flat roof 'study' also element projects forward of the house, adding an asymmetrical sense of 'balance' to either side of the house in this regard. That element is taller in scale than the garage and link wall, thereby limiting its effectiveness in that regard.

The proposal would add further built presence to the front by building in front of the existing 'link' wall between the house and garage, but this would be of very limited size/mass/bulk in the context of the existing built arrangement on site. It would not

project wide enough from the garage to be sited in front of the front elevation of the existing house, thereby preserving its dominant and original character and appearance, whilst its single storey scale and matching materials would articulate it as a subordinate addition. It would be taller in scale than the existing link wall, but it would match that of the converted 'study' counterpart opposite, improving the sense of symmetry and balance to these elements of the house, further articulated through matching front fenestration and retention of its set back siting relative to the converted study. Because of this improvement when viewed from the street scene in front, the increased height of the garage would not be overly dominant, and would in fact aid in articulating it as a distinct structure subservient to the main mass and function of the dwelling house, whilst still being subordinate in scale and size to it. For the same reasons of subordinate scale, size and appearance, the same view is considered of the rear extension and terrace.

It is noted that a further increase to the size of the rear terrace is proposed, but at the levels proposed (increase of 150mm) this would normally be considered permitted development. Notwithstanding if this is the case, the amount and height increase proposed is not considered detrimental to the character of the dwelling or area, nor to afford opportunities for overlooking/loss of privacy to the rear/rear garden of the adjacent property to a degree sufficient to warrant refusal.

Whilst rooflights are proposed, these would be of the conservation variety with minimal visual impact/height off the slope of the existing roof and not readily prominent when viewed from the street scene of Densley Close and are therefore considered acceptable in this instance.

Would the proposal have an impact on the amenities and values of the area?

Yes No N/A

Comment:

Maintains existing vernacular of area regarding the form/design, retention of flat roof and sufficiently matching fenestration and materials of the host property.

Would the development maintain the amenity of adjoining and future occupiers? (E.g. privacy, outlook, loss of light etc.)

Yes No N/A

Comment:

Vehicle Hardstandings Only

Would the hardstanding retain an appropriate balance between hard and soft landscaping?

Yes No N/A

Comment:

Would only the minimum length of hedgerow required to access the hardstanding be removed? (e.g. privacy, outlook, light etc.)

Yes No N/A

Comment:

If not in accordance with the policy are there any other considerations which warrant a decision other than refusal

N/A

Conditions

1-5 EM01

6. EM13.1 The development/works shall not be started and completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details: 1:1250 site location plan & 2223 EXSP 1 & 2223 EX 1 & 2223 EX 2 & 2223 EX 3 & 2223 EX 4 & 2223 PSP 1 & 2223 P 1 & 2223 P 2 & 2223 P 3 & 2223 P 4 received and dated 23/12/2014.

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 Council.

7. EM03

Informative

INF.11 – Damage to grass verges

Signature _____

Date _____