

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

**DELEGATED APPLICATION**

**Application No:** 6/2018/2063/EM  
**Location:** 5 Howicks Green Welwyn Garden City AL7 4RJ  
**Proposal:** Replace polycarbonate conservatory roof with lightweight tiled roof  
**Officer:** Mrs Sarah Madyausiku

**Recommendation:** Refused

6/2018/2063/EM

<b>Context</b>			
<b>Site and Application description</b>	The application site is a two storey mid terrace dwelling house, located on the eastern side of Howicks Green; close to the junction with Howland's. The property benefits from a conservatory at the rear of the property which is seen from public views from Queen Avenue.		
<b>Constraints</b>	Estate Management Scheme, as defined within the Leasehold Reform Act 1967		
<b>Relevant history</b>	The conservatory was granted Estate Management consent in 2004. Ref: W6/2004/0677/EM.		
<b>Notifications</b>			
<b>Neighbour representations</b>	Support: 0	Object: 0	Other: 0
<b>Summary of neighbour responses</b>	None		

<b>Relevant Policies</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EM1 <input type="checkbox"/> EM2 <input type="checkbox"/> EM3 Others			
<b>Considerations</b>			
<b>Does the design (form, size, scale, siting) and character (appearance within the streetscene) maintain and/or enhance the amenities and values of the area?</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <b>Comment</b> (if required):			
<p>Policy EM1 states: Extensions in the Garden City are typically designed with a flat roof. In this part of the Garden City the quality of the architecture has largely been maintained with flat-roof extensions and additions being a typical feature. In addition, within this area, there are examples of conservatory type extensions with differing roof forms.</p> <p>Policy EM1 of the Estate Management Scheme (Extensions and Alterations) seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to existing properties will only be allowed if they are in keeping with the</p>			

design, appearance, materials and architectural detailing used in the existing building. That policy is there in order to preserve the unique architectural heritage of the town and its buildings and therefore the Council expects that all applications for extensions and alterations respect and do not harm the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

This proposal is to replace the existing polycarbonate conservatory roof with a new roof the same size and footprint. However the new roof would be a "lightweight tiled" roof rather than the polycarbonate panels as existing.

The introduction of a more solid sloping tiled roof, rather than the existing roof form would represent a more dominating development to the rear of this property that would be harmful to the amenities and values of the host property and to the surrounding terrace and area as a whole. The conservatory type extension, with the solid sloping roof, would be visible from public viewpoints as well as surrounding properties due to its location, causing additional harm.

The proposal would fail to enhance the appearance of the existing property given its pitched roof design with a more 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.

The proposal, by virtue of its pitched solid roof design, would fail 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, the terrace or the surrounding area 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 solid pitched roof design and form, would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the application property and the surrounding properties and streetscene. 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.

<b>Plan Number</b>	<b>Revision Number</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Received Date</b>
Location Plan		Location Plan	8 August 2018
Block Plan		Block Plan	28 August 2018
D4		Floor Plans	28 August 2018
D3		Rear Elevation	28 August 2018

**Determined By:**

Mr Chris Carter  
22 October 2018