
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/21/3280282

18 Dinmore, Bovingdon, HP3 0QW

- 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 David Horsley against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01354/RET, dated 29 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is as built variation to dormer size and fenestration (following approved scheme, ref 4/01562/19/FHA) as retrospective application.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of variation to dormer size and fenestration (following approved scheme, ref 4/01562/19/FHA) at 18 Dinmore, Bovingdon, HP3 0QW, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/01354/RET, dated 29 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, namely: 100 site location; 101-106 existing; and 107-114 proposed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 18 Dinmore is a two storey semi-detached house of brick and tile located in an established residential area. The surroundings are characterised by mainly two storey houses in a mix of brick, painted render and weatherboarding walls and tiled roofs. The development the subject of this appeal is a flat roofed rear dormer window which has already been completed.
4. I consider the policies relevant in this case include CS12 of Dacorum's Local Planning Framework Core Strategy 2006-2031 (the Core Strategy) and saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 (the local plan). These relate to the quality of design and require, among other things, that development avoid visual intrusion and respect adjoining properties in terms of matters including scale, bulk and materials.
5. The dormer runs the full width of the house and is clad in light grey Cedral weatherboarding. There is a full height central window which according to the

submitted plans serves a staircase and two windows serving a bedroom and a bathroom.

6. The Council accepts that the size of the dormer falls within permitted development, but objects to the type and colour of the cladding. There are numerous large dormer windows in the surrounding area in a variety of materials, though the majority are of a darker colour.
7. In general, weatherboarding is a common feature in the area, used for full first floor cladding on several nearby properties, in both dark brown/grey and white (for example at 7 and 31 Dinmore) and for projecting feature panels on front elevations in both dark grey and white (for example in Pembridge Road). Other lighter coloured materials in the area include white painted render and numerous garage doors.
8. I consider that, although the dormer at No. 18 is clearly visible from the neighbouring properties, it is not unduly prominent in views from the street as it is at the rear and appears only in glimpses at a distance through gaps in the houses. Although the colour of the cladding is different from that of the house itself, the weatherboarding is not out of keeping with the surroundings and the pale colour in contrast with darker brick materials is not an uncommon feature of other properties in the area.
9. I conclude that the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the area and that it is consistent with Core Strategy policy CS12.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. Since the development has been completed no conditions are necessary.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR