

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

<b>APPLICATION No:</b>	<b>W6/2012/2560/EM</b>
<b>APPLICATION Site:</b>	<b>22 Walden Road, Welwyn Garden City</b>

**DESCRIPTION OF SITE:**

The application site is a plot measuring approximately 55m deep and 11m wide located to the north of Welwyn Garden City town centre in a conservation area. The plot features a two storey semi-detached property with a garage partially linked to the side of the main dwelling house. The house measures approximately 7.1m wide and 9.5m deep. The garage measures approximately 2.5m wide, 5.6m deep and 2.1m and 4.1m high to eaves and pitched roof ridge height respectively.

The garage is located to the side of the plot, adjoining the garage of No.22 with a shared roof ridge forming a symmetrical appearance between the two garages. The garage is set back approximately 3m from the building line of the front elevation of the main dwelling house. It is linked to the house by a single storey element approximately 4m long, flush with the front elevation of the garage and culminating approximately 1m from the rear elevation building line of the property, which spans the distance of approximately 1.1m between the house and garage.

The garage features white timber doors at its front, and dark stained timber weatherboarding and roof tiles. It does not feature any windows.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

The proposal seeks to demolish and rebuild the existing garage on a larger footprint and to a higher eaves height and alter the existing 'infill' element joining the garage and main dwelling house.

The replacement garage would occupy the same footprint and width as the existing garage. Its front elevation would project approximately 800mm further than existing, culminating approximately 2.2m from the building line of the front elevation of the main dwelling house. The rear would extend along the adjoining boundary with the garage of No.22 approximately a further metre, bringing it flush with the rear elevation of the main dwelling house. It would measure approximately 2.8m and 4.1m high to eaves and roof ridge height respectively. A window would be sited on the eastern elevation, internally within the 'gap' between the extended rear side elevation of the garage and side elevation of the house, opposite a window in the house, and another to the rear elevation oriented towards the rear garden. It would feature materials to match the existing dwelling house. Whilst no specific reference is

made to the use of replacement timber cladding in the application form, the Design and Access Statement submitted with the application states that this is proposed and this appears evident on the submitted plans.

The infilled gap between the garage and main dwelling house would retain the same footprint, but would feature a sloping roof with an additional 100mm height at its eaves on the garage side, extending approximately a further 500mm upslope to adjoin the side elevation of the main dwelling house. Its roof would feature glass panels.

A parallel application (ref. W6/2012/2557/EM) is also under consideration at the adjoining property at No.20, which symmetrically features a shared garage roof ridge with the application site, for a replacement garage at that property which would retain the same footprint to the side, extend beyond the proposal to the rear, and project approximately 800mm forward of the existing garage, flush with the proposed garage.

**ESTATE MANAGEMENT HISTORY:**

W6/1994/5398/EM - Erection of first floor rear extension – Approved 16/01/95

W6/1992/5025/EM - Single storey rear extension – Approved 19/05/1992

**SUMMARY OF POLICIES:**

1967 Leasehold Reforms Act – Estate Management Scheme:

Estate Management Scheme Policies October 2008:

EM1 – Extensions and alterations

**CONSULTATIONS:** None

**TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS:** None

**REPRESENTATIONS:**

None, period expired

**DISCUSSION:**

The main issues are:

- 1. Whether the proposal accords with the Policy EM1; and**
- 2. Other Material Planning Considerations**

**1. Whether the proposal accords with the Policy EM1**

The character and appearance of much of Welwyn Garden City has a quality that consists of carefully designed layouts with formal and symmetrical patterns where the design and detailing of architecture is in groups and individual buildings.

Therefore in order to preserve the unique architectural heritage of the town and its building the Council expects that all applications for extensions and alterations respect and do not harm the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

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 buildings. 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 amenities 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.

The street scene is characterised by similar properties allowing for subtle variations in architectural detailing, with garages and small side extensions prevalent. The proposal would replace the existing garage on its same footprint, which is visible from the street scene, and extend it at the front and rear by approximately 800mm and 1m respectively, in addition to raising the eaves height by approximately 700mm. The raised eaves would create additional mass and scale at this element which would be visible from the street scene. However, as it would feature a ridge height to match the existing ridge height, shared with the adjoining garage, this is not considered to result in a readily discernible increase in scale, mass or associated bulk when viewed from this area. Accordingly it would not detract from the amenities and values of the Estate Management area or detrimentally impact upon the design, appearance or architectural detailing of the building in this regard. This would be further mitigated by the use of materials to match the existing dwelling house and garage, in accordance with the requirements of policy EM1. In this regard, in order to ensure a high quality finish in keeping with the design, appearance, materials and architectural detailing used in the existing building as required by policy EM1, a suitable condition to require material samples of external surfaces to be submitted for approval prior to development is considered necessary should permission be granted. This condition could ensure that appropriate weatherboarding is used in this element of the extension.

The parallel application (ref. W6/2012/2557/EM) at No.20 which symmetrically features a shared garage ridge with that of the application site has not yet been determined. Whilst that application would match the increased eaves height and forward projection of 800mm of this proposal, as that scheme has not been determined this application is considered on the basis of its impact on the existing development at No.20. In this regard, the increase in eaves height, whilst noticeable, is not considered prominent when read from the street scene of Walden Road. From here, the additional 700mm height of eaves on the application site would not appear detrimental to the character of the shared garage design due to the same height roof ridge and through the use of appropriately matching materials. It would project a further 800mm than the adjoining garage frontage and whilst not an ideal design, at less than a metre deep and through the use of matching materials, the depth difference, whilst apparent from the side vistas, would not be overly prominent, particularly from close by or direct views from the street scene of Walden Road as to detract from the design, appearance and architectural detailing of the dwelling house or to cause harm to the amenities or values of the Estate Management area sufficient to warrant refusal.

The rear extension of approximately 1m would not be discernible from the street scene, would sit flush with the rear building line of the existing dwelling house, and would sit adjacent to the garage at No.20, which at the location it would adjoin, currently stands at approximately 2.2m high. As this rear extension would not be discernible from the street scene, and due to its limited depth of an additional metre, which would not project beyond the building line of the rear elevation of the original dwelling house, its associated additional scale, mass and bulk which would be added to the garage would clearly be very limited and subordinate to and in keeping with the original dwelling house. If the proposal at the adjacent garage at No.20 is not implemented, whilst the proposed rear extension would feature one side of the shared symmetrical 4.1m high garage roof ridge extending beyond that of No.22 adjacent to its current 2.2m high rear garage roof ridge, at 1m deep, and on the far side of the garage from No.22 at a rear location not discernible from the street scene, such an impact is not considered detrimental to the design, appearance or architectural detailing of either building. Nor would it cause a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the surrounding area. Therefore this element would accord with policy EM1 in this regard.

The proposed change of flat roof to sloping roof at the infilled element between the garage and main dwelling house is not normally a feature characteristic of properties in the Welwyn Garden City Conservation Area and Estate Management area where single storey side elements normally feature, or are approved with, a flat roof. However, in this instance, as the slope would be required to facilitate the drainage due to the higher walls either side of this element, and owing to its limited angle and additional maximum height of approximately 500mm, when read against the backdrop of the taller two storey main dwelling house and adjacent garage walls, this change, whilst visible from the street scene, is not considered detrimental to its amenities or values and would be in keeping with the design and character of the dwelling house and surrounding area. Whilst glass is proposed on its roof this would not be visible from the street scene and would be limited to this element only, and accordingly would not result in a discernible impact to the design, appearance, materials and architectural detailing of the building. Therefore the sloping roof on this infill element would accord with policy EM1.

do not have a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the surrounding area

Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to detrimentally impact upon the character, amenities or values of the surrounding area, and is considered to comply with policy EM1.

## **1. Other Material Planning Considerations**

**Protected Species:** No impact.

### **CONCLUSION:**

The proposal would be in keeping with the visual appearance and character of the property and the surrounding area and would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of the adjoining properties and therefore complies with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme. In addition, there is not a reasonable likelihood of protected species being present.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**

**CONDITIONS:**

1-5 EM01

- 6 C.13.1 The development/works shall not be completed other than in accordance with the approved plans and details: drawing numbers: 2861-E01 & 2861-P01 & 2961-OS2 & 2961-OS1 received and dated 6 December 2012 unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

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.

**Pre Development**

- 7 EM02 Material samples

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

It is considered that the proposed development does not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the amenities and values of the area in which it is located. It is therefore in compliance with the Estate Management Scheme.

**INFORMATIVES:**

None

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