



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2025

by **K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A1910/D/25/25/3373423**

**25 Crossways, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire, HP3 8PU**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Imran Iqbal against the decision of Dacorum Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 25/01831/FHA.
  - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side/rear/front extensions and replacement roof incorporating rear dormer and rooflights.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the street scene of Crossways and Green Dell Way.

### Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling, No 25, is a detached house set on a wide corner plot in a street of mainly semi-detached houses. There is a detached dwelling opposite No 25 that is similar to the appeal property. This house has been extended at two storeys to the side towards Green Dell Way. The two storey element of the appeal property is modest with three first floor bedrooms. However, it has extensive single storey elements which reach to the side boundary with No 23 and project noticeably forward of the main two storey façade of the dwelling. Following an earlier refusal of planning permission, the appellant took pre-application advice from the Council to which I have had regard, including the extent to which the amended plans submitted during the process showed improvements in line with the officer recommendations.
4. The proposed single storey front extension would have a front facing gabled roof with a ridge noticeably below the height of the first floor eaves. It would be some 1.8m deep, projecting the same amount as the existing single storey side elements. Although larger than traditional porches which can be seen in Crossways, it would not be out of place in a street where single storey front projections are characteristic. Neither do I consider that its modest scale would disrupt the predominant linear form of the dwelling or that of other houses in the street. Moreover, I note that the pre-application advice indicated that it was likely to be supported by officers. Overall, I find it acceptable.

5. The proposed first floor side extension above existing single storey elements would not be set back from the main façade. Nevertheless, the forward projection of the existing ground floor and addition of a pitched roof to the front elevation of this would result in an appearance of set-back. The extension would be about half the width of the original main dwelling and less than half the width of the single storey side projection. Overall, this would ensure that it appeared in keeping with and proportionate to the host dwelling.
6. A similar width two storey side/rear extension is proposed at the opposite end of the dwelling. Although this would result in a house about twice the width of the original two storey facade, it would provide balance with the first floor side extension, and the overall width at first floor would not be out of place in a street characterised by wide semi-detached pairs, some of which have first floor side extensions. Moreover, a stepping in of the rear section of the flank elevation facing Green Dell Way, as suggested in the pre-application advice, would ensure a harmonious and subordinate appearance. The use of a mixture of brick and render, coupled with the single storey front projections and full height first floor windows illuminating the main staircase would break up the main façade, reducing the perceived mass and bulk, introducing visual interest and ensuring that the side extension appeared proportionate and sympathetic to the dwelling. On balance I find it acceptable.
7. A two storey rear extension is proposed behind the original house and most of the two storey side extension. This would be visible from Green Dell Way above the boundary fence and from nearby properties. It would have a brick and render finish to match the front elevation. Although wide, its depth would be some 3.6m which would result in a rear projection noticeably less than the depth of the dwelling. The proposed design of the extension, set in from the side elevation of the two storey side/rear extension and with twin rear gables set well down from the ridge with a single storey flat roofed section between, would result in a well-proportioned and compatible appearance taken in the context of the dwelling as a whole.
8. A loft conversion with front roof lights and a rear dormer is proposed. This would necessitate an increase in the height of the main ridge of some 0.77m which in the context of the existing modest roof height would be significant. The eaves height would be maintained and so as well as the significant increase in height, a noticeable increase in pitch would be necessary. In combination, the increase in height and pitch would result in a roof that stood out from the relatively uniform roofscape of dwellings in Crossways where, although the houses vary, the roofs have a consistency that would be materially disrupted.
9. The appellant notes that the roofs of neighbouring properties are higher than that at the appeal dwelling. However, the difference is small and does not stand out, due in part to the similar pitch. It is also noted that the similar dwelling opposite No 25 has front facing rooflights. Nevertheless, any loft conversion at this property appears to have been achieved within the original roof. It is suggested that the officer providing the pre-application advice verbally accepted the principle of a small increase in ridge height. However, this does not appear to be reflected in the written response. In any case I cannot agree that the proposed increase is small.
10. Whilst I find the well-spaced rooflights and modest rear dormer acceptable, the loft conversion as a whole, which would result in a material increase in ridge height and roof pitch would be alien in Crossways. The position of the dwelling on a wide

corner plot, making it prominent in the street scene, would exacerbate the harm. Overall, the raising of the roof would result in the dwelling appearing materially taller and bulkier than other dwellings nearby and out of character with the street scene. This would be unacceptable.

11. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed extensions and specifically the proposed roof extension would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, including the street scene of Crossways and Green Dell Way. In consequence, it would conflict with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Core Strategy 2006 – 2031, adopted 2013, saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011, adopted 2004, and the National Planning Policy Framework.
12. Taken together and amongst other things these expect new development, including householder extensions, to be of good design that is sympathetic to, respects and enhances local character and is visually attractive such that it integrates with the streetscape. In particular, extensions should harmonise with the existing house and surroundings in terms of design and character, should not project above the roof line, and the roof form should match the existing house in terms of design, including angle of pitch. Overall, roof extensions should maintain the common design characteristics of the street and not disrupt a clear, consistent roof line and form.
13. Third parties raise concerns regarding loss of privacy and overshadowing. In terms of 9 Green Dell Way, the Council acknowledges the close proximity of the rear extension to the shared boundary but concludes that obscure glazing in the closer of the proposed rear bedroom windows would overcome this. I have no reason to disagree. Third parties suggest that obscure glazing should also be required in the rear dormer. However, this would be no closer to the shared boundary than existing windows and so I do not consider that any material loss of privacy or overlooking would occur.
14. In respect of 23 Crossways, I agree with the Council that the orientation of the dwellings and their relative position would ensure that there was no material overshadowing or loss of light or outlook at that property.
15. A number of other matters are raised by third parties. Those relating to character and appearance are addressed above. In terms of other concerns, firstly, the appellant did engage with the Council through a pre-application process and did amend the design in accordance with a number of the suggestions made. Secondly, I find the submitted plans sufficiently clear, and since landscaping and car parking areas already exist and there are no significant changes to these, further details are not necessary. Finally, in terms of increased flood risk, this concern appears to relate to areas of existing hard landscaping at the property which are not part of the proposed development. Moreover, I have no evidence that the proposed extensions would exacerbate flood risk.
16. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*KE Down*  
INSPECTOR