



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/23/3321313

5 The Shrubbery, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, HP1 2TG

- 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 Alex Wentford and Miss Changela against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00451/FHA, dated 20 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor front link extension, infill front extension and front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. 5 The Shrubbery is a two storey detached house formed of two sections linked at ground floor level on an L-shaped footprint. The eastern part was formed into a granny annex by converting the original garage and constructing an upper floor above. It is located at the end of a cul-de-sac with five other properties (Nos. 6-10) to the northeast and southeast, closely grouped around a spur road off the head of the cul-de-sac.
4. I consider that the relevant policies in this case are CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2031 (the Core Strategy) and Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan 1991-2011 (the local plan). These relate to the quality of neighbourhood and site design in terms of several criteria including scale, height and visual intrusion and the construction of dormer windows.
5. The Council raised no objection to the proposed first floor link extension, the infill front extension or the front dormers and I see no reason to disagree with this view.
6. The proposed rear dormer would extend most of the width of the eastern section of the house and would be set down from the ridgeline. However, the submitted plans indicate that the set back above the eaves would be minimal

and it would appear as though the main wall of the dormer would be in a similar plane to that of the main wall of the house, thus adding to the impression of disproportionate height and bulk. This proposal is a reduction in size from a previous scheme which extended across more of the width of the roof. However, I consider that, although it is smaller, it would still be a very large and bulky element in proportion to the house itself and would have a visually dominant impact on the street scene near the house.

7. The layout of this group of houses is very compact, and although the dormer is nominally on the rear elevation of No. 5, it effectively fronts onto a short street and directly faces the front elevations of other houses in the group across a short distance of approximately 11 metres. The size, design and location of this large dormer would appear out of proportion with the house itself and in the context of the closely spaced group of houses.
8. The appellants have drawn my attention to rear dormer windows in the surrounding area. I do not have any information regarding the circumstances under which these were permitted and I have considered this case on its own merits according to individual circumstances.
9. I conclude that the proposed rear dormer window would harm the character and appearance of the existing house and the street scene, contrary to policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy and Saved Appendix 7 of the local plan.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR