
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 November 2023

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/N1920/D/23/3327779

89 Gills Hill Lane, Radlett, Hertfordshire WD7 8PD

- 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 Niall McGowan against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0185/HSE, dated 2 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two storey front, side and rear extensions with integral garage following removal of side extension, construction of garden room to rear of garden, insertion of rooflight to front and loft conversion with associated dormer to rear.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/N1920/D/23/3327854

89 Gills Hill Lane, Radlett, Hertfordshire WD7 8PD

- 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 Niall McGowan against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0184/HSE, dated 2 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two storey front, side and rear extensions with integral garage following removal of side extension, construction of garden room to rear of garden, insertion of rooflight to front and loft conversion with associated dormer to rear.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A. The appeal is dismissed.
2. Appeal B. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The decision relates to two proposals of the same description at the same property. Where appropriate they have been assessed together in this decision.
4. The Council granted planning permission under reference 22/1708/HSE for a similar form of development to that described above. The two appeal proposals could be considered as amendments to the approved scheme.
5. In both appeals, the Council's concerns relate primarily to the part single, part two-storey front extension element of the proposals. The Council found the other elements of the appeal proposals acceptable as they replicate the

approved scheme or constitute minor amendments to it. There are no reasons to take a different view. Accordingly, this decision focusses only on the matters in dispute.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in both appeals are the effect of the proposed part single, part two-storey front extensions on the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the surrounding area.

Reasons

7. Gills Hill Lane has a varied character, containing properties of varying types and design. It has an irregular building line, with some buildings standing well forward of their neighbours, including the semi-detached pair of houses comprising the appeal property (No 89) and No 87. The pair stands opposite the T-junction with Rendlesham Avenue.
8. The Appeal A scheme proposes a single-storey front extension across part of the front of No 89, whereas Appeal B proposes a full width extension. The depth of both extensions from the existing front elevation would be 2.5m. This would be 1.5m beyond the depth of the approved front extension.
9. In both appeals, there would be a considerable increase in bulk and massing at the front of the property resulting from the additional 1.5m depth. This would amount to an incongruous and prominent form of development which, along with the extent of the forward projection, would harm the appearance of the host property. It would also unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair to a significantly greater degree than in the approved scheme.
10. The 'step' in the front elevation at the side of the bay windows is an original design feature of both the appeal property and its neighbour and is important to their character. The proposed infilling at first floor level would result in the loss of this bay detail in both appeals and this would be detrimental to the unique character and appearance of both houses.
11. The ground floor would project well beyond the front of the neighbouring Nos 87 and 91 and the other properties that form its visual context. As noted above, the semi-detached pair of No 87 and 89 stand closer to the roadside than the adjacent properties. This, combined with their prominent position opposite the road junction would exacerbate the dominating effect of the proposed developments on the street-scene and would harm the character of the surrounding area.
12. Neighbouring properties differ in design to Nos 87 and 89. However, the differences in their architecture contribute to the richness of the street scene. This does not justify making significant and visually harmful alterations to the appearance of a property, particularly when it is one of a pair.

Other matters

13. Neighbour objections to the proposals have been considered. In addition to the main issues dealt with above, the other points raised were addressed by the Council when approving planning application ref 22/1708/HSE. In respect of Appeal B, when compared to the approved scheme, the depth of the ground-floor and first-floor rear projections would increase by about 1m towards No

91. The Council raises no objections in this regard, considering that there would be minimal effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. There are no reasons to disagree.

Overall conclusion

14. I conclude that in both appeals the significant increase in the bulk and mass of development would significantly harm the form, character and appearance of the host dwelling. Both proposals would unbalance the front elevation of the semi-detached pair, including through their impacts on the bay detailing, to an unacceptable degree. The developments would be visually intrusive and would fail to respect the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area by reason of their dominating and incongruous forward projections.
15. For these reasons, both of the proposed developments fail to comply with Policies SP1, CS22 and CS25 of the Core Strategy 2013, Policies SADM30 and SADM40 of the Site Allocations Development Management Policies Plan 2016, Part D & E of the Planning and Design Guide, Policy HD3 of the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan 2021 alongside the Radlett Design Code. The National Planning Policy Framework requirement for high quality design would not be satisfied.
16. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised Appeals A and B are dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR