



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1950/D/22/3300571

69 Maple Grove, Welwyn Garden City AL7 1NN

- 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 D Franks against the decision of Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 6/2022/0287/HOUSE, dated 8 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.69 Maple Grove (No.69) is a two-storey dwelling forming one end of a terrace of four on the south side of Maple Grove. To the rear, No.69 has been extended at ground floor with a staggered rear building line. It is proposed to extend at first floor over part of the ground floor extension with a rear projecting gable.
4. I saw on my site visit that the existing ground floor extension has a fairly high rear parapet wall and is therefore visible from Maple Grove, even above a wooden structure to the side of No.69. The proposed extension would be a maximum depth of 4.8m and has been designed so that its rear elevation would be flush with the ground floor. Because of this depth, the proposed extension would be visible from Maple Grove but views of it would only be in close proximity (mostly from the junction of Maple Grove and Runsley) and, by virtue of the front building line and spacing between No.69 and No.67 Maple Grove, would be limited in extent. The proposed extension would not therefore appear unduly prominent or cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
5. Further, the proposed extension has been designed with a gable projection, which would be set down from the main ridge of the existing roof, and would use the same facing brickwork and clay roof tiles as the host dwelling. Such a projecting gable over an existing ground floor extension, even at a depth of

- 4.8m, would not be a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling and it would appear subordinate to the existing rear elevation.
6. However, the proposed extension would have a set-back element, of 3.6m in depth, closest to the adjoined neighbour at No.71 Maple Grove (No.71). This has been designed to ensure no harm is caused to the living conditions of the neighbours at No.71, but the result is a set-back in the gable elevation which would be only around 1m in width with an oversailing pitched roof. This would be an awkward and poor design detail and the roof form in particular would appear contrived. This I find would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Further, whilst I saw on my site visit that there have been other two-storey gable extensions on Maple Grove these have avoided such awkward design details.
 7. Consequently, the appeal proposal would conflict with policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan (2005) which together require the standard of design in all new development to be of high quality and respect the character and context of the area. It would also conflict with the design objectives of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and notably the guidance at paragraph 130 that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Conclusions

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR