

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2019/0221/EM
Location: 348 Howlands Welwyn Garden City AL7 4HD
Proposal: Installation of 1 x rear dormer to facilitate extension of existing loft
Officer: Mrs Sarah Madyausiku

Recommendation: Refused

6/2019/0221/EM

Context	
Site and Application description	<p>The application site is a two storey mid terrace dwelling house, located on the north side of Howlands. The application property is located within a row of 13 terraced houses. The rear of this terrace, and the application property itself, is open to public views from a public footpath that runs across the rear of the terrace to the east.</p> <p>The proposal is to install a rear dormer to facilitate the extension of the loft. The proposed rear dormer window would measure at approximately 5.2m in width and be set in 0.74m on the west side and 0.94m on the east side of the party walls of the adjoining properties.</p> <p>Its height would be at the ridge height of the main roof.</p> <p>This proposal is <u>identical</u> to a recent application refused in September 2018 ref: 6/2018/1861/EM. This September 2018 proposal was heard by the Estates Management Scheme panel in January 2019.</p> <p>After debate and deliberation the Panel resolved to uphold the original decision and dismiss the appeal confirming the reasons for refusal set out in the previous decision notice dated 27 September 2018.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted the application again because she wishes it to be determined and then have another opportunity to have the case heard at an appeals panel.</p> <p>During the submission, it was explained to the applicant that it would be advisable to alter the proposal to try to overcome the reasons for refusal before taking it back to any appeals panel, but this advice was not taken on board.</p> <p>It should be noted that a previous consent in July 2018 allowed for <u>two separate</u> smaller rear dormers that would achieve a similar room layout (bedroom and en-suite) as that required by the applicant. This was re-iterated to the applicant, however, they wish to have more usable space, so wish to progress an elongated dormer window.</p>
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967

Relevant history	<p>Application Number: 6/2018/1326/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 09 July 2018 Proposal: Construction of 2 x rear dormer windows to facilitate extension of existing loft conversion</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2018/1861/EM Decision: Refused Decision Date: 27 September 2018 Proposal: Installation of 1 x rear dormer to facilitate extension of existing loft</p> <p>This current application is identical to this refused proposal.</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2018/2889/EM Decision: Refused Decision Date: 19 December 2018 Proposal: Installation of 1x rear dormer window to existing loft conversion</p>		
Notifications			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Summary of neighbour responses	None		
Relevant Policies			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM1 <input type="checkbox"/> EM2 <input type="checkbox"/> EM3 Others			
Considerations			
Design (form, size, scale, siting) and Character (impact upon amenities and values of Garden City)	<p>1.1. The key issue in the determination of this case is the impact of the proposed rear dormer on the amenities and values of the surrounding area. The impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers is considered acceptable.</p> <p>1.2. In recognition of the importance of Welwyn Garden City as a unique town and in order to protect the amenities and values of the Garden City, the Estate Management Scheme was set up. The purpose of the Management Scheme and its importance to homeowners is to ensure that homes and street scenes are kept in harmony with the original design and concept of the town.</p> <p>1.3. Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme (EMS) 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.</p> <p>1.4. The application property is located within a terrace of 13 similarly designed properties. None of these properties have rear dormer windows. This property would be the first to have such an alteration in this group of 13.</p> <p>1.5. Policy EM1 aims for alterations to be in keeping with the existing property and not harm the values and amenities of the area. It is therefore essential that the uniformity in appearance of dwellings is maintained; in particular those features which are visible from the street</p>		

	<p>scene.</p> <p>1.6. The proposed rear dormer is unacceptable in width, height, scale and sitting. In the Garden City for roof alterations such as dormer windows, the Council has approved a new policy approach within the EM area which includes that consent will only be granted if the proposed alteration, when viewed from any surrounding public vantage point does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider amenities and values of the area.</p> <p>1.7. The quality of the architecture in this terrace of 13 dwellings has generally been maintained and it is of note that in July 2018, an application, which assessed two individual and smaller dormer windows covering less of the rear roof slope was approved (ref: 6/2018/1326/EM).</p> <p>1.8. Although not implemented, the consent remains extant. In the officer's report in July 2018 it was stated: <i>The proposed rear dormers would not be visible from public vantage points. The appearance isn't overbearing to the rear as two smaller dormers are proposed rather than one large dormer on a mid-terrace dwelling.</i> It is clear from this assessment that a larger dormer was not considered appropriate here.</p> <p>1.9. Rather than two individual dormer windows as approved in July 2018, the introduction of one elongated rear dormer would represent a more dominating form of development to the rear roof slope of this property. The elongated dormer would not read as a subordinate roof form within the rear roof slope of the terrace as a whole. It would be more visible, given its more solid and unbroken form and is considered to be harmful to the amenities and values of the property itself and to the wider surrounding area.</p> <p>1.10. Views of the rear roof slope of the appeal property and its neighbours are readily visible from the public footpath to the east of the site and therefore an elongated dormer across most of the rear of the appeal property would be very apparent causing significant harm to the amenities and values of the area.</p> <p>1.11. In comparison to the two rear dormers granted consent in July 2018, one elongated dormer as proposed would be more visually intrusive than two separate dormers given its larger size and more solid and bulky form. From this public view point to the rear, the more solid roof form of the elongated dormer on the appeal property and as part of the terrace as a whole would be very apparent and would result in a more dominating form of development.</p> <p>1.12. In addition, the height of the elongated dormer would be at the ridge height of the main roof and not set down. This is an unwelcome design. It is good design practice to set any such roof additions down from the main roof ridge so that the addition can read as a subordinate element on the roof slope.</p> <p>1.13. In previous correspondence the applicant comments on this design by saying "We are unable to have a pitched roof or lower the roof line further, as we are already having to lower first floor ceilings inside the property to allow for enough headroom in the loft room. Every millimetre</p>
--	---

	<p>will count. The room will be fairly small inside and the design of a straight across dormer will make such a huge difference to us inside the house, giving us that little bit more space". However, it is considered that such a dormer is not appropriate and should not be allowed for the sake of internal modifications.</p> <p>1.14. No new or amended proposals are brought to the Council for consideration, and for this reason no different conclusion is made on the harmful impacts of the proposal. The rear dormer window would be unacceptable by virtue of its width, height, scale and siting on the rear roof slope of the dwelling which is overtly visible from a number of properties in the area and from the public footpath to the east. The dormer would result in a visually discordant and incongruous feature that would be detrimental to the appearance of the house and wider area, failing to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of the Garden City in accordance with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.</p> <p>1.15. The applicant has been advised to amend the proposal before considering taken this same scheme back to any appeals panel.</p>
--	---

Conclusion

The rear dormer window would be unacceptable by virtue of its width, scale and siting on the rear roof slope of the dwelling which is overtly visible from an number of properties in the area and from the public footpath to the east. The dormer would result in a visually discordant and incongruous feature that would be detrimental to the appearance of the house and wider area, failing to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of the Garden City in accordance with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The rear dormer window would be unacceptable by virtue of its width, height, scale and siting on the rear roof slope of the dwelling which is overtly visible from an number of properties in the area and from the public footpath to the east. The dormer would result in a visually discordant and incongruous feature that would be detrimental to the appearance of the house and wider area, failing to maintain and enhance the amenities and values of the Garden City in accordance with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
4416-P01	C	Plans & Elevations As Proposed	1 February 2019
4416-OS2		Block Plan	1 February 2019
4416-OS1		Location Plan	1 February 2019
4416-E01		Plans & Elevations As Existing	1 February 2019

Determined By:

Mr Michael Robinson
28 March 2019