

WELWYN HATFIELD BOROUGH COUNCIL  
ESTATE MANAGEMENT APPEAL PANEL – 24 AUGUST 2017  
REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (PUBLIC PROTECTION, PLANNING  
AND GOVERNANCE)

6/2017/0813/EM

311 KNIGHTSFIELD, WELWYN GARDEN CITY, AL8 7NJ

ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

APPLICANT: Ms R Cantor

(Sherrards)

**1 Background**

- 1.1 This is an appeal against the refusal of Estate Management Consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The application (6/2017/0813/EM) was refused for the following reasons:

*'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.'*

**2 Site Description**

- 2.1 The appeal site is located on the west side of Knightsfield and comprises of a two storey semi- detached dwelling with an attached side garage. The property also benefits from an existing single storey extension to the rear which forms a play room and a rear conservatory. This extends across only a section of the rear of the property. The frontage is set back from the highway and includes a hard standing and a hedgerow along the front boundary.
- 2.2 The immediate street scene is residential in character with properties similar in size and design to the host property.

**3 The Proposal**

- 3.1 The original application sought Estate Management consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory. This would infill a gap between the original rear wall and the existing extension off the garage.

#### **4 Relevant Estate Management History**

- 4.1 W6/2001/1427/EM – Erection of rear conservatory – Granted 17<sup>th</sup> December 2001
- 4.2 It is also noted that the property benefits from a single storey rear extension. It is evident that this permission was granted prior to when the Estate Management Scheme was imposed in 1973, as a result of a planning application submitted in 1972.

#### **5 Policy**

- 5.1 Estate Management Scheme Policies (October 2008):
- 5.2 EM1 – Extensions and Alterations

#### **6 Discussion**

- 6.1 This is an appeal against the refusal for Estate Management Consent. The appellant's letter of appeal is attached at Appendix 1 and the delegated officer's report for application 6/2017/0813/EM, is attached at Appendix 2.
- 6.2 The key issue in the determination of this appeal is the impact the development would have on the amenities and values of the subject property and the surrounding area of Welwyn Garden City.
- 6.3 Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme (EMS) refers to proposals for extensions and alterations, the policy clearly 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. 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.
- 6.4 The appeal site consists of a two storey semi-detached property with a pitched roof with an original single attached garage to the side and a single storey rear extension.
- 6.5 Within the Garden City, single storey rear extensions are characteristically designed with flat roofs in order to maintain a consistent design and appearance. The extension would feature a flat roof and is therefore considered to respect the character and design of the original dwelling and would therefore be in keeping with the character of the area. Furthermore, 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.

- 6.6 The Estate Management Scheme is in place to ensure that the special character of the environment is preserved. The majority of extensions that fall within the Estate Management Area and granted consent under the Scheme are modest in depth. In this instance, the appeal site currently benefits from a 3 metre deep rear conservatory which would be removed. The proposed extension would be located at the rear of the original dwelling where it would extend a total depth of 5.9 metres off the original rear wall. This extension would extend deep into the rear garden and when compared to the original property which measures approximately 7.2 metres in depth, the extension would result in a substantial increase in bulk and mass to the original property which would fail to appear subordinate in scale. Furthermore, the proposed extension would adjoin to an existing extension to the rear of the property. The extension would extend across a significant width of the property and garage and would extend deep into the rear garden. Whilst the extension would extend the same distance as the existing garage, the extension would infill a large area of existing space to the rear of the property. The combined extension would be excessive and the cumulative scale of the extension would result in substantial form to the rear of the property, which would fail to respect the character and appearance of the building and its environment.
- 6.7 The Estate Management Scheme is important in ensuring that the setting of properties with special character are respected and preserved. It is considered that the combined built form of the extensions at the appeal property would represent poor quality alterations to the building which would fail to respect the unique architectural heritage of the original building leading to the erosion of the special character of the environment. Subsequently, the proposed extensions would represent inappropriate development that would impact detrimentally on the values and amenities of the Garden City.
- 6.8 Policy EM1 outlines that extensions and alterations should not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours through loss of day/sun/skylight, loss of privacy and outlook.
- 6.9 The appellant refers to the fact that no objections were received from neighbours during the consultation process. However, it should be noted that Officers are required to assess the impact on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers of both current and future occupiers. Whilst it was noted that the extension was set in 1 metre from the boundary, as a result of the proposed height and depth of 5.9 metres projecting off the rear wall, it is considered that the proposed extension would appear excessive and unduly dominant which would result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjoining property of No.313 Knightsfield. It is considered that the proposed extension would materially affect the residential amenity of the adjoining resident in terms of being overbearing and giving a sense of a more enclosed, built environment in terms of outlook to the extent beyond what would be reasonable to expect to. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy EM1.

- 6.10 The appellant makes reference to the Prior Approval Scheme for a Larger Householder extension which was granted permission at the appeal site. Whilst it is noted by officers that modern day living gives rise to larger extensions, particularly as a result of the Government Prior Approval Scheme for Larger Householder Extension, it should be noted that the Estate Management Scheme is separate to the Town and Country Planning Act and therefore is required to be assessed against the relevant policies of the scheme. The Estate Management Scheme was set up 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 purpose of the Estate Management Scheme is to ensure that homes and street scenes are kept in harmony with the original design and concept of the town. Therefore, under the Estate Management Scheme, the proposed extension is contrary to Policy EM1.
- 6.11 The appellant also outlines that the extension would not be visible from the streetscene and would therefore have no impact on the wider area. It was concluded within the Officers Report that as a result of the rear siting of the extension, there would not be a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the streetscene of Knightsfield or surrounding area. However, this would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the appeal property and its environment.

## **7 Conclusion**

- 7.1 The proposed extension combined with the existing extension on the appeal site would result in excessive built form from the original rear wall of the property which would fail to remain subordinate in scale to the original property. As a result, the extension would represent poor quality of design that fails to respect and relate to the original property and the special character of the environment which it forms. In addition, the extension would appear unduly overbearing to the adjoining property of No.313 Knightsfield and would therefore have a detrimental impact on their residential amenity. The proposal would therefore have a detrimental impact on the amenities and values of the property and the surrounding area contrary to Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme.

## **8 Recommendation**

- 8.1 That Members uphold the delegated decision and dismiss the appeal.

Lucy Hale (Development Management)  
Date: 26 July 2017

### Background Information

Appendix 1: Appellant's Statement  
Appendix 2: Officer Report



Council Offices, The Campus  
Welwyn Garden City, Herts, AL8 6AE

Title: 311 Knightsfield Welwyn Garden City

Scale: DNS

Date: 2017

Project: EMAP Committee

Drawing Number:  
6/2017/0813/EM

Drawn: Baras Mast-Ingle

© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council LA100019547 2016