

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2020/3177/EM  
**Location:** 38 Brockswood Lane Welwyn Garden City AL8 7BG  
**Proposal:** Erection of a part single part double storey rear extension  
**Officer:** Mr James Homer

**Recommendation:** Refused

6/2020/3177/EM

<b>Context</b>			
<b>Site and Application description</b>	<p>No.38 is a two storey semi-detached property located upon the northern side of Brockswood Lane.</p> <p>The application seeks Estate Management Scheme consent to demolish an existing rear conservatory and erect a part single, part two storey rear extension, incorporating an existing ground floor extension.</p> <p>Please note that due to the restrictions in place as a result of the Coronavirus pandemic, no site visit was made to the rear of the site. However, the case officer was satisfied that the application could be assessed using observations from the street and using the plans submitted by the applicant.</p>		
<b>Constraints</b>	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
<b>Relevant history</b>	<p>Application Number: W6/1992/5100/EM      Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 13 April 1992  Proposal: Replacement garage</p> <p>Application Number: W6/1996/5016/EM      Decision: Granted  Decision Date: 13 February 1996  Proposal: Rear conservatory</p> <p>Application Number: W6/2001/0920/EM      Decision: Granted      Decision Date: 20 August 2001  Proposal: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2020/3182/HOUSE      Decision: Withdrawn      Decision Date: 11 January 2021  Proposal: Part single part double storey rear extension</p>		
<b>Notifications</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 1
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	<p>36 Brockswood Lane</p> <p>Comment: The design of the single storey part of the proposal impacts on the single storey extension already in existence for the semi-detached</p>		

	neighbouring property. It is not clear from the published plans how the single storey part of the proposed extension will affect the character and appearance of the single storey extension which is already part of the neighbouring property.
<b>Consultee responses</b>	No comments received.
<b>Relevant Policies</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM1 <input type="checkbox"/> EM2 <input type="checkbox"/> EM3 Others	
<b>Considerations</b>	
<b>Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (impact upon amenities and values of Garden City)</b>	<p>Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme states that extensions and alterations to existing properties 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.</p> <p>Rear extensions should complement the character and style of the original home through the matching of materials, scale, fenestration, proportions and architectural detailing. The overall scale of a rear extension should be proportionate and adequately subordinate to the original property and should not over dominate rear gardens. Single storey extensions should have a depth no greater than 4m (where appropriate). Two storey extensions require greater levels of sensitivity to take into regard the proximity of neighbouring properties. As a result, an offset of up to 3.7m from the rear of the original building line may be acceptable, although lesser depths may be required for properties in close proximity to their neighbours. Upper floor roof pitches should be consistent with the original design of the property where the extended roof is designed to merge with the existing roof structure</p> <p>The existing conservatory is to be demolished to allow room for the proposed single storey extension. The existing single storey extension is positioned to the detached side of the building and has a depth of approx. 4.7m. This is deeper than the preferred maximum however this was approved under W6/2001/0920/EM.</p> <p>The proposed single storey extension would be adjoined to the eastern side of the existing extension at a depth of 4.7m and would extend across the full width of the property in place of the demolished conservatory. Adjacent to the shared boundary with 36 Boundary Lane the proposed extension would be approx. 3m in height and higher than the existing conservatory. At 4.7m in depth across the full width of the house and 3m in height, the proposed extension is not considered proportionate or adequately subordinate to the original home.</p> <p>The first floor element of the proposed extension would be positioned above the existing section of the ground floor extension with a depth of 4.7m and approx. width of 6.7m. The proposed extension features a hipped roof which, although matches the pitches of the existing roof, it set at the same height. The roof drops lower than the existing roof on the eastern side of the extension to accommodate the width proposed. The height of the proposed roof does not establish a subordinate relationship to the main building and the depth of 4.7m contributes further to the disproportionality.</p>
<b>Impact on neighbours</b>	The existing conservatory is upon the boundary with no.36. Although the proposed extension would be at the same depth as the conservatory, the

	additional height and solid structure of the extension is likely to overbearing. The concern raised by no.36 regarding the shared wall is outside of EM consideration, however, the applicant would only be able to undertake work within the boundary of their property. Any work to tie in the extension on the neighbour's side would require their consent.
<b>Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)</b>	None.
<b>Any other considerations</b>	None.
<b>Conclusion</b>	
The proposed extension is considered too deep, and will result in an addition that would not be proportionate or adequately subordinate to the original house. This would be exacerbate as the roof has not been stepped down to appear subservient to the main building. In addition the proposed extension would introduce an overbearing addition upon the shared neighbour boundary with no.36. Accordingly, the application fails to comply with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.	

**Reasons for Refusal:**

1. The proposed extension is considered too deep, and will result in an addition that would not be proportionate or adequately subordinate to the original house. This would be exacerbate as the roof has not been stepped down to appear subservient to the main building. In addition the proposed extension would introduce an overbearing addition upon the shared neighbour boundary with no.36. Accordingly, the application fails to comply with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

**REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS**

2.

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
DP1069-01	-	Existing Plans & Elevations, Proposed Floor Plans	18 January 2021
DP1069-03		Location & Block Plan	25 November 2020
DP1069-02	-	Proposed Elevations	18 January 2021

**Determined By:**

Mr James Homer  
25 January 2021

