



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: 26th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/23/3327106

20 Bridle Way, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, HP4 1BS

- 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 Perryman against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01214/FHA, dated 18 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey front garage extension, single storey front, side and rear extension, two storey front and side extension, extension to front dormer window. Alternative scheme to application Ref 23/00547/FHA.
-

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. 20 Bridle Way is a detached two storey house with a distinctive front catslide roof over the forward projecting garage and a front dormer. It is located in an established residential area on a corner at the junction of Bridle Way and Haynes Mead and is one of a group of eight houses of similar design on Bridle Way and Haynes Mead. Although they appear to have had some alterations since their original construction, they have retained much of their original form and design.
4. The relevant policies in this case include CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2006-2031 (the Core Strategy) which relate to the quality of neighbourhood and site design in terms of several criteria including scale, height and visual intrusion. Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan 1991-2011 (the local plan) relates to the construction of small scale house extensions which should harmonise with the original design of the house and maintain the common design characteristics of a row of houses where these have a uniform design and roof line.
5. There have been a number of previous proposals for extensions to No. 20, most recently for single storey extensions to the front, side and rear and an enlarged front dormer which was permitted in 2023 (ref 23/00547FHA). At the

time of my visit, it appeared that works were being carried out to implement this permission and that most of the hedging along the side boundary with Haynes Mead had been removed.

6. The appeal proposal includes the elements permitted under 23/00547/FHA, together with an additional element, namely the construction of a two storey extension to the front and side. The latter would be set back from the garage front but would be forward of the existing first floor part of the house and rise from the front wall of the permitted single storey front extension. It would run the full depth of the side elevation of the existing house with a front gable over the forward projection and a side gable of similar pitch to that of the existing main roof.
7. I consider that the scale and design of the proposed two storey extension would appear as an incongruous element, particularly due to the front gable roof design and forward projection, out of keeping with the distinctive form and design of the existing house and the pattern of development of the other, similar houses nearby. The house is in a prominent location on the corner and the siting of the extension close to the side boundary, fronting Haynes Mead, would result in it being highly visible from public viewpoints.
8. I have taken account of the examples of other two storey side extensions nearby and find that the houses differ in their original design characteristics and are not directly comparable to the appeal property. I have considered this proposal on its own merits.
9. I conclude that the proposed two storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing house and the street scene, contrary to Core Strategy policies CS11 and CS12 and Appendix 7 of the local plan.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR