



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2014

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8 October 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/C1950/D/14/2224329

45 Bramble Road, Hatfield, AL10 9RZ

- 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 M Shinnick against the decision of Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council.
 - The application Ref S6/2014/960/FP was refused by notice dated 1 July 2014.
 - The development proposed is proposed two storey side, part two storey rear and part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side, part two storey rear and part single storey rear extension at 45 Bramble Road, Hatfield, AL10 9RZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S6/2014/960/FP, dated 6 May 2014, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: unnumbered 1:1250 scale site location plan; BD/14/16/1; BD/14/16/2B; and BD/14/16/3A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant's case erroneously refers to the London Plan 2011, which only applies to the Greater London area, and I have therefore disregarded any references made to this development plan document.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property (No 45).

Reasons

4. No 45 is a two storey, semi-detached house, with hipped roof, within a street which is primarily characterised by similarly designed houses.

5. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a two storey side and a part single and part two storey rear extension, which would in part replace a now demolished garage. The two storey elements of the proposal would have a hipped roof form, reflecting the roof type that is characteristic within this street, with ridge levels 1.5 metres below that of the host property¹.
6. There would be no separation between the northern corner of the proposed side extension and the shared boundary with No 43, as a consequence of the angled nature of this boundary. However, the front elevation of the proposed side extension would be set back behind No 45's front elevation by 2.5 metres and that with this set back the proposed extension would have a subservient appearance relative to the host property. The rearward projection of the single and two storey elements of the extension would be 3.475 metres and I find at this depth that this part of the appeal scheme would not be visually dominant.
7. As a consequence of the tapering nature of the boundary between Nos 43 and 45 and the side extension's setback, I find that the siting of these properties relative to another is such that the potential for terracing to arise would be limited. I therefore find this to be a factor that does not weigh against the appeal development.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development as a whole would be appropriately scaled and would not detract from the character and appearance of No 45. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the various two storey and first floor side extensions I observed in Bramble Road, not least the substantial additions at Nos 22 and 24 directly opposite No 45. I therefore find I find in this case that there would be no conflict with the objectives of Policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005 and the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance 2005, which require new development amongst other things, to be well designed and respectful of its context and, in relation to residential extensions, to be subordinate to the host property.
9. As I have found the proposed development to be appropriately scaled and designed, I also conclude there would be no conflict with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. I therefore conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. Other than the standard time limit condition, I find it necessary that the development should be constructed: in accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans; and in materials to match those of the exterior of the existing house, in the interests of the proper planning of the area. I have therefore imposed conditions to this effect.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR

¹ A dimension referred to in the Council's delegated officer report