

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/2786/EM
Location: 28 Brockwood Lane Welwyn Garden City AL8 7BG
Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension including alterations to openings
Officer: Ms Lucy Hale

Recommendation: Refused

6/2017/2786/EM

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The application site consists of a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the north side of Brockwood Lane. The site benefits from a single storey rear extension and a detached outbuilding.</p> <p>The application seeks estate management consent for a single storey side and rear extension following the demolition of the existing detached outbuilding. The extension would feature a flat roof design and would extend approximately 10.7 metres in depth.</p>		
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
Relevant history	<p>Application Number: W6/1992/5376/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 01 February 1993 Proposal: Single storey rear extension</p> <p>Application Number: W6/1993/5035/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 05 August 1993 Proposal: Planting of a Purple Beech hedge on two sides of front garden</p> <p>Application Number: W6/2013/1382/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 02 September 2013 Proposal: Erection of rear summerhouse and access gate, part alterations to existing rear fence</p> <p>Application Number: W6/2014/2442/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 05 February 2015 Proposal: Replacement of two rear windows with timber bi-fold patio doors</p>		
Notifications			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Summary of neighbour responses	None		
Consultee responses	None		
Relevant Policies			

EM1 EM2 EM3
Others

Considerations

Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (impact upon amenities and values of 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.

Within the Garden City, single storey side and rear extensions are characteristically designed with flat roofs in order to maintain a consistent design and appearance, remaining adequately subordinate in scale to the property. The proposed extension would feature a flat roof design which would be of an acceptable ridge height, which would respect the character and appearance of the dwelling and would be in keeping with the character of the area.

The materials are proposed to match those of the original dwelling and the fenestration detailing is also considered acceptable. Accordingly, no objections are raised with the appearance of the rear extension.

With regard to scale, the proposed extension is sizeable and would measure approximately 10.7 metres in depth and would create an 'L' shape along the side boundary of the site. Whilst it is noted there is an existing timber outbuilding within the site which sits within the proposed footprint, this is notably smaller in scale to the extension proposed. The outbuilding measures approximately 5.3 metres in depth by 2.7 metres wide, the proposed extension would double in depth at 10.7 metres and enlarge in width to 3.8 metres. When considered as an extension to the property, by virtue of the siting and size, it is not considered to respect or relate to the scale of the original dwelling and would result in an incongruous addition. The proposed extension would extend the built form significantly into the rear garden, eroding the special character of its environment.

It is considered that the proposal, by virtue of its scale and bulk, fails to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of the Garden City.

Impact on neighbours

No neighbour representations have been received.

The extension would be built along the shared boundary with No.26 Brockswood Lane. Whilst the extension would extend some depth into the rear garden, it would be of single storey nature at a height of approximately 2.7 metres with a flat roof. As a result of the outbuilding, separation distance and boundary treatments, it is not considered that the extension would result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of this neighbouring occupier in terms of loss of light, overbearing impact or privacy.

Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)

N/A

Any other considerations

N/A

Conclusion

The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its scale and excessive depth, would fail to appear

subordinate in scale and respect the design and form of the original dwelling. The proposed extension would result in an incongruous addition to the application dwelling which that would fail to maintain the amenities and values of the Garden City, contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed rear extension, would result in an excessive depth of built form in relation to the original dwelling which would fail to remain subordinate in scale and respect the character and form of the original dwelling. The extension would result in an incongruous addition that would fail to maintain and preserve the amenities and values of the Garden City and therefore the proposed development would be contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
4247-E01	A	Plans And Elevations As Existing	11 December 2017
4247-OS1		Location Plan	27 November 2017
4247-OS2		Block Plan	27 November 2017
4247-P01	B	Plans And Elevations As Proposed	27 November 2017

Determined By:

Mr Michael Robinson
5 February 2018