



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2010

by **Philip Wilson RIBA MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Decision date:
18 March 2010**

Appeal Ref: APP/C1950/D/10/2121803

65 Pine Grove, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, Herts AL9 7BL

- 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 Ms Lindsay Cornelissen and Mr Timothy Lee against the decision of Welwyn Hatfield District Council.
- The application Ref: S6/2009/2307/FP, dated 8 October 2009, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2009.
- The development proposed is front extension to garage.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for front extension to garage at 65 Pine Grove, Brookmans Park, Hatfield, Herts AL9 7BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: S6/2009/2307/FP, dated 8 October 2009, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on submitted plan number 0801/08A.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the existing building and the street scene.

Reasons

3. A forward extension of the garage by roughly 3 metres would add to the bulk of the existing building but would not, in my opinion, adversely affect its form or character. Given its modest scale, I do not consider that the extension would dominate the existing dwelling. As the extended garage would be positioned roughly 12 metres from the public highway, behind a notional building line drawn between neighbouring houses, I see no reason why it might be a prominent or disturbing feature of the street scene.
4. My conclusions take account of the objectives of policies D1 and D2 of the Welwyn Hatfield District Plan 2005, together with supplementary planning guidance. I find no obvious conflict with policies D1 or D2 or with published guidance on scale and design. Examples of other extensions have been drawn to my attention but my decision is based solely on the planning merits of the

proposal before me. In the absence of a sustainable objection to the proposal, I conclude that planning permission may be granted, subject to conditions.

5. The first condition requires development to be commenced within 3 years. This is a statutory requirement. I see no reason to extend that period to 5 years, as suggested by the Appellants. The second condition requires external materials to match the existing building. This is to ensure compatibility with the main dwelling. The third condition is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
6. I have taken into consideration all other matters raised, but for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Wilson

INSPECTOR