

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

DELEGATED APPLICATION

Application No: 6/2017/0813/EM
Location: 311 Knightsfield Welwyn Garden City AL8 7NJ
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension
Officer: Ms L Hale

Recommendation: Refused

6/2017/0813/EM

Context			
Site and Application description	<p>The application site consists of a two storey semi-detached property with an attached side garage located on the west side of Knightsfield. The property is set back from the highway and benefits from a driveway to the front.</p> <p>The application seeks estate management consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. The proposed extension would measure approximately 5.9 metres deep by 5.5 metres wide with an approximate height of 2.8 metres, set in appropriately 1 metre from the boundary. The extension would feature a flat roof design and matching materials.</p>		
Constraints	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
Relevant history	Application Number: W6/1990/5152/EM Date: 18 June 1990 Proposal: Two storey rear extension	Decision: Granted	Decision
	Application Number: W6/2001/1427/EM Date: 17 December 2001 Proposal: Erection of rear conservatory	Decision: Granted	Decision
Consultations			
Neighbour representations	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
Summary of neighbour responses	N/A		
Consultee responses	No responses received.		
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	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,		

<p>amenities and values of Garden City)</p>	<p>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>The application site consists of a two storey semi-detached property with a pitched roof and single attached garage to the side. The application seeks estate management consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory.</p> <p>Within the Garden City, single storey 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.</p> <p>The materials are proposed to match those used in the constructed of the original dwelling and the fenestration detailing is also considered acceptable. Accordingly, no objections are raised with the appearance of the rear extension.</p> <p>However, with regard to scale, the proposed extension is sizeable and would measure approximately 5.9 metres in depth by 5.5 metres in width. The extension would almost double the floor space of the original ground floor dwelling, resulting in a substantial addition to the dwelling. The proposed size and bulk of the addition would not respect or relate to the size of the application property and would therefore result in harm to the character and appearance of the application property. Furthermore, when considered alongside the existing single storey rear extension to which it would attach, would result in an excessive extension to the property. Additionally the proposed extension would extend the built form significantly into the rear garden and whilst it would extend to the same extent as the existing playroom, it would infill the entire space to the side of that extension up to the boundary resulting in a significant increase to the overall mass and bulk of the dwelling.</p> <p>Given the rear siting of the extension, it is noted that the extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of Knightsfield when viewed from a public vantage point. However, the harm that is caused by the extension is to the application property, which this is not considered to outweigh.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Impact on neighbours</p>	<p>In relation to the impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers the impact is measured in terms of neighbouring properties access to day/sun/sky light, overshadowing, loss of privacy/overlooking and impact on outlook.</p> <p>No representations have been received from either adjoining neighbour. The two neighbouring properties are No. 309 and 313 Knightsfield.</p> <p>With regard to 309 Knightsfield, this property is located to the south west of the host dwelling. The proposed rear extension would infill an area behind the garage and playroom. Given the siting behind this part of the property, which would not project further in depth, it is not considered to result in any impact on the residential amenity of this neighbouring occupier.</p> <p>With regard to No.313 Knightsfield, this property sits to the north east of the property and is attached. It is noted that No.313 does not benefit from a rear</p>

	<p>extension. Due to the orientation of that property to the north east, the height of the proposed extension, along with the set in of 1 metre from the boundary and the existing boundary treatment, it is not considered that there would be an undue loss of light to this neighbouring property. However, despite the set in of 1 metre, the proposed extension would extend substantially in depth and would be visible above the existing boundary hedge. It is therefore considered that the extension would appear unduly dominant from No.313 Knightsfield which would result in harm to the residential amenity of this adjoining neighbour to the extent that would warrant refusal.</p> <p>It is not considered that there would be a loss of privacy as a result of the extension as no side facing windows are proposed and it would be single storey.</p>
Landscaping issues (incl. hardstandings)	N/A
Any other considerations	N/A
Conclusion	
<p>The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its size and bulk, would fail to reflect the design of the host dwelling and present an unduly dominant addition which would detract from the design and appearance of the application property. Furthermore, the proposed extension is considered to result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining occupier at No.313 Knightsfield. Accordingly, the proposal fails to maintain the amenities and values of the Garden City contrary to Policy EM1 of the Welwyn Garden City Estate Management Scheme.</p>	

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed rear extension, would result in an excessive depth of built form from the original rear wall of the property which together with existing extensions at the property, would fail to remain subordinate in scale to the original property. Accordingly, the proposal fails to maintain and preserve the amenities and values of the Garden City, contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.
2. By virtue of the substantial depth and height of the proposed extension it would appear unduly overbearing to the adjoining property, No. 313 Knightsfield and would have a detrimental impact on their residential amenity. Accordingly, the proposal fails to maintain and preserve the amenities and values of the Garden City, contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

REFUSED DRAWING NUMBERS

3.

Plan Number	Revision Number	Details	Received Date
1993-03a		Existing & Proposed Elevations	20 April 2017
1993-02a		Proposed Floor Plans	20 April 2017
1993-01		Existing Floor Plan	20 April 2017
1993-04		Site & Block Plan	20 April 2017

Determined By:

Mrs S Smith
15 June 2017