
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday, 04 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1950/D/20/3247301

8 Dudley Hill Close, Welwyn AL6 0QQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs M. Bissmire against the decision of Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 6/2019/2667/HOUSE, dated 22 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing detached garage, rear conservatory and outbuildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing detached garage, rear conservatory and outbuildings at 8 Dudley Hill Close, Welwyn AL6 0QQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 6/2019/2667/HOUSE, dated 22 October 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4778-OS1; 4778-OS2 A; and 4778-P01 D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The planning application sought permission for extensions to both the side and rear of the property. However, from the evidence before me, I consider that the Main Issue is the effect of the proposed side extension upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached dwelling. The adjoining property at 6 Dudley Hill Close is constructed to broadly similar proportions. This is reflected at the neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses at 10 and 12 Dudley Hill Close. Whilst these dwellings are constructed to similar

proportions, they feature several differences in terms of colour, front porch design, fenestration types and garage design. These differences are emphasised by variations in landscaping and driveway design. The surrounding residential properties are constructed to different designs and scales. This contributes to a variety

4. Whilst the proposed development would result in a dwelling of larger proportions, the development would be viewed in an area which features many different types of dwellings in terms of scale, siting and design. In consequence, the development would not erode a particularly dominant character in the surrounding area. In addition, the pattern of development in the surrounding area means that views of the proposed side extension would be screened by the existing semi-detached dwellings at Nos. 6, 10 and 12. As such, the proposed extension would not be particularly prominent.
5. The proposed extension would result in a reduction in the space between the appeal site and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 10. However, the proposed extension would be set back from the side boundary and as the existing garage would be demolished, a gap would still exist between the two buildings. This would enable views of the trees to the rear of the appeal site to still take place.
6. In reaching this view, I have had regard to the fact that owing to the pattern of development in the vicinity, the extension would only be readily viewed from the area directly in front of the existing dwelling. In consequence, the gap between the appeal site and the neighbouring dwelling at No. 10 does not play a significant role in the definition of the area's character.
7. In addition, the surrounding area can be characterised by the presence of dwellings constructed in a variety of designs and scales. In result, the neighbouring dwellings have differing footprints and therefore the gap between other existing dwellings is variable. Owing to the lack of a consistent gap, the construction of the proposed extension would not be injurious to the area's character.
8. I have also noted that the proposed extension would be constructed to a design that is subordinate towards the existing dwelling as it would include a set back from the front elevation and ridge height that is lower than the existing house. These factors would also reduce the prominence of the proposed side extension.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed side extension would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, is in conformity with Policies D1, D2, and GBSP2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan (2005); and the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan Supplementary Design Guidance (2005). These, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new developments have a design of a high quality; respect and relate to its context; and that developments are compatible with the character of towns.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions as suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of precision. Whilst there are several different dwelling designs in the surrounding area, extensions are typically

constructed from the same materials as the original dwelling. In consequence, a condition requiring that the extension is constructed from the same materials as the existing dwelling is necessary and reasonable so that the extension would harmonise with its surroundings.

Conclusion

11. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted for the proposed development.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR