



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/21/3284123

25 Beaumayes Close, Hemel Hempstead HP1 1SW

- 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 Mrs Jennifer Wells against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03109/FHA, dated 9 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension at 25 Beaumayes Close, Hemel Hempstead HP1 1SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03109/FHA, dated 9 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: J1803/P01 Rev A; J1803/P02; J1803/P03; J1803/P04 Rev A; J1803/P05 Rev A.
 - 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 dwellinghouse.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposal was amended during the planning application process. The Council made its decision based on the amended plans. I have determined the appeal on the same basis as the Council.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site relates to a two storey dwelling with a gabled principal elevation, a set back two storey side projection and a single storey projection to its front and side. It is located at the end of a row of dwellings from Nos 1 to 25 Beaumayes Close (odds), which were constructed from the same original design. The dwellings in the row have undergone few alterations and the repetition of front facing gables and linking flat roof projections within the row provide it with a

sense of rhythm. However, neither the site nor the surrounding properties have a strong sense of symmetry as purported by the Council. Notably, Nos 1 and 25 have been extended and the site has a larger front garden than most of the properties. There are a limited number of other house types evident and thus the built environment has a consistent and coherent appearance.

5. The close is located on a hill. Long distance views over lower properties and towards large areas of trees and vegetation are gained from near the entrance to the close. There is also a significant gap between the dwellings at Nos 25 and 27, with the latter much closer to the highway. In addition, an area of open space with trees and vegetation is prominent at the end of the close. For these reasons, the area has a relatively spacious and verdant character.
6. While the extension would be wide relative to the existing dwelling, it would be set back slightly from the dwelling's front wall at first floor level. Additionally, it would have a front gable that would reflect the appearance of, but be smaller than, the front gable of the existing dwelling. The extension's surfacing materials and fenestration design would reflect those of the dwelling. The extension would therefore be a proportionate addition that would be compatible with the dwelling.
7. Although none of the properties in the close feature extensions of a comparable design, the extension would not be highly prominent given the dwelling's set back from the highway and the extension's set back from the first floor part of the dwelling's front elevation. Furthermore, as the site is at the end of the row, its consistent and cohesive appearance and rhythm would not be disrupted. The building lines and patterns of development in the close would not be adversely affected. Additionally, a significant gap would be retained between Nos 25 and 27 such that the proposal would not appear cramped or create a terracing effect. The character of the site and the close would be maintained.
8. The proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It accords with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Council's Core Strategy 2006-2031, which seek to preserve attractive streetscapes and ensure that development integrates with the character of streetscapes. It also accords with paragraph 130(b) and (d) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which aims to secure visually attractive development and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. Whilst not specified on the decision notice, I do not consider that the proposal conflicts with appendices 3 or 7 of the Council's Local Plan 1999-2011, or HCA10 of the Area Based Policies Supplementary Planning Guidance, which advise on the layout and design of residential areas and house extensions and provide development principles for proposals in Hammerfield South.
9. A planning condition to require the surfaces of the development to match the existing materials would ensure that the proposal is compatible with the dwelling on site and neighbouring properties. Additionally, the standard time and approved plans conditions are required in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR