

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/0492/EM
Location: 47 Broomhills Welwyn Garden City AL7 1RE
Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension with the installation of 3 rooflights.
Officer: Mrs S Madyausiku

Recommendation: Refused

6/2017/0492/EM

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The subject property is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling house. The property is situated within a group of eight similar properties located on the northern side of Broomhills close to the junction with Strawfields. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature.</p> <p>The applicant seeks Estate Management consent for the erection of a rear extension with a maximum height of 3.7m, and an eaves height of 2.3m and a width of 6.1m. It would have a depth of 3.5m. The extension would have a solid sloping roof with three rooflights.</p>		
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
Relevant history	<p>Application Number: 6/2016/1203/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 10 August 2016 Proposal: Formation of vehicle hardstanding</p> <p>Application Number: 6/2016/2738/EM Decision: Granted Decision Date: 02 March 2017 Proposal: Erection of new lean-to conservatory to rear of property and removal of hedge between property no.47 and no.49.</p>		
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Summary of neighbour responses	None		
Consultee responses	1. Councillor Mike Larkins None 2. Councillor Barbara Fitzsimon None 3. Councillor Nathaniel Chapman None		

Relevant Policies

EM1 EM2 EM3

Others

Considerations

Does the design (form, size, scale, siting) and character (appearance within the streetscene) maintain and/or enhance the amenities and values of the area?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if required): Policy EM1 states:

'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.'

The front of the properties within Broomhills are characterised by flat-roof single storey structures that contribute to the amenities and values of the area and the Garden City. The quality of the architecture in this area has largely been maintained with flat-roof extensions and additions being a typical feature. To the rear, flat-roof, full width extensions have been approved and there are examples of conservatory type extensions within the terrace and within Broomhills as a whole.

It is considered that the introduction of a full width extension, with a sloping roof, rather than a flat roof would represent a more dominating form of development that would be harmful to the amenities and values of the surrounding area. The solid materials used in the construction of the roof exacerbate this dominant structure. Whilst there is a consent for an extension at the property (granted in February 2017 ref: 6/2016/2738/EM) that featured a sloping roof, the extension was half width and was of a lightweight material, having a glass roof, rather than a solid roof.

The proposed extension would fail to enhance the appearance of the existing property given its pitched roof design with a solid roof form. The extension would appear out of keeping with the property and the surrounding properties and form an overly dominant form to the rear of the dwelling which is unacceptable.

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

Does the development minimise impact on neighbours?

Yes No N/A

Comment (if required): The proposal would not adversely affect the light amenity, privacy or increase overlooking between the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. The proposal would not be overbearing to neighbouring dwellings.

Vehicle Hardstandings Only. Sections (a) and (b) completed only if hardstanding proposed
(a) Would the hardstanding retain an appropriate balance between hard and soft landscaping?

Yes No

Comment (if required): N/A

(b) 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 required):

Any other considerations

None

Conclusion

The proposal is not reflective of the character and appearance of the dwelling or the terrace and would have a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the surrounding area and the Garden City as a whole. This conflicts with Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal, by virtue of its pitched roof design, would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the application property and the surrounding properties. It would fail to represent high quality design, and would be detrimental to the amenities and values of the Garden City. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

2.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
B1	1	Existing Plans & Elevations	14 March 2017
B2		Proposed Plans & Elevations	14 March 2017
B3		Proposed Block Plan	16 March 2017

Informatives:

1. Please note that this decision does not refer to the shed shown in the rear garden. If a shed is proposed then a separate Estate Management application will be required in that regard.

Determined By:

Mrs S Smith
5 May 2017