



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/22/3300226

35 Meadway, Welwyn Garden City AL7 4NQ

- 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 Allan Carter against the decision of Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 6/2022/0228/HOUSE, dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey extension with mono-pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey extension with mono-pitched roof at 35 Meadway, Welwyn Garden City AL7 4NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, 6/2022/0228/HOUSE, dated 1 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Location Plan (ref. MEA-03-001-00); Existing Ground Floor Plan (ref. MEA-03-010-00); Existing Elevations (ref. MEA-03-20-00); Proposed Ground Floor Plan (ref. MEA-03-100-00); and Proposed Elevations (ref. MEA-03-110-00).

Main Issue

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

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the development before me than the planning application form. It is also the description of development provided by the appellant in part E of the appeal form.

Reasons

4. No.35 Meadway (No.35) is located at the end of a short terrace of four dwellings on the north side of Meadway. It has a front two-storey flat roof projecting bay, characteristic of the area, and to the side an attached single garage. The appeal proposal is for a single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling that would also project partly to the side, but behind the existing garage.
5. The extension has been designed with two mono-pitched elements of different widths and heights that together extend almost the full width of the dwelling forming an asymmetrical gable to the rear. The larger of the two proposed elements, to the kitchen/dining area, extends to a maximum height that is above the sills of the existing first floor windows. Notwithstanding this height, the main bulk of the proposed extension would appear single storey broadly aligning with the eaves and ridge of the conservatory extension to the attached neighbour at No.33 Meadway. Inevitably the proposed extension would add bulk and mass to the rear and side of No.35, but it would nonetheless appear proportionate to the host dwelling and would not overly dominate the rear elevation.
6. I observed on my site visit that flat roofs form part of the character of the area, notably in the form of projecting front gables and outbuildings or garages. The eaves of the proposed extension would project slightly above the existing attached flat roof garage of No.35 such that the mono-pitched roof would be visible within the streetscene. However, because of the front building line of dwellings on Meadway and spacing between the terraces, it would only be visible in close proximity to No.35 when travelling east to west. The roof profile would be relatively low at this point (it would pitch toward the centre of the dwelling) and the proposed dark render and zinc cladding would result in the extension appearing recessed. Although visible, the proposed extension would appear subordinate to the main elevation of No.35 and would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the area.
7. The proposed extension is deliberately contemporary in design including the choice of materials. Whilst I recognise that additions to other dwellings on Meadway are predominantly brick or glazed (conservatories), the proposed zinc cladding, render and large areas of glazing would complement the existing design of No.35, notably reflecting the colour tones of the existing brickwork. It would therefore be consistent with the guidance in the Council's *Supplementary Design Guidance* (2005) that extensions should be designed to '*complement and reflect the design and character of the dwelling*' rather than necessarily match it. In this regard, it would also accord with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework in so far as it seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.
8. In conclusion on the main issue, the proposed extension would represent good design, remaining subservient to the host dwelling and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, there would be no conflict with Policy D1 or D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan (2005) which together require high quality design that respects and relates to the character and context of the area.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard condition for implementation of the planning permission. In addition, for the avoidance of doubt, it is necessary to impose a condition listing the approved drawings which, in this case, also provide details of the proposed materials.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR