



PLANNING

Civic Centre Marlowes
Hemel Hempstead
Herts HP1 1HH

MR N M ROWE
13 LANGLEY AVENUE
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD
HERTS
249929

MR S JACKSON
20 COTTERELLS HILL,
HEMEL HEMPSTEAD,
HERTS,
HP1 1JD

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

APPLICATION - 4/01185/99/FHA

20 COTTERELLS HILL, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HERTS, HP1 1JD
ROOM IN THE ROOF AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Your application for full planning permission (householder) dated 28 June 1999 and received on 30 June 1999 has been **GRANTED**, subject to any conditions set out overleaf.

Director of Planning

Date of Decision: 10 August 1999

CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO APPLICATION: 4/01185/99/FHA

Date of Decision: 10 August 1999

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match in size, colour and texture those used on the existing building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

3. The ground floor en-suite window shall be permanently fitted with obscure glazing.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) (with or without modification), no windows, dormer windows, doors or other openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed.

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings.



Appeal Decision

Site visit held on Wednesday, 5 January 2000

by **Stephen J Pratt BA (Hons) MRPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for the
Environment, Transport and the Regions

The Planning Inspectorate

PLANNING DEPARTMENT	
DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL	
100 High Street Bristol BS2 0DJ Tel: 0117 987 8077	
DATE	FILE
12 JAN 2000	
11 JAN 2000	

DA#
EB
LK

Appeal: T/APP/A1910/A/99/1030465/P4

- 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 brought by Mr & Mrs C J Carter against Dacorum Borough Council.
- The site is located at 25 Middleknights Hill, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire.
- The application (ref: 4/01186/99/FHA), dated 30 June 1999, was refused on 20 August 1999.
- The development proposed is a single-storey front extension.

Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

The development plan

1. In this case, the relevant planning policy context is provided by the Dacorum Borough Local Plan, adopted in 1995. Policy 8 expects a high standard in all development proposals, including the layout, design, scale, bulk and materials. Proposals should respect the townscape and general character of the area and avoid harming the surrounding neighbourhood and adjoining properties through, amongst other factors, visual intrusion.
2. Policy 9 applies the Plan's Environmental Guidelines which cover small-scale house extensions. These advise that extensions should harmonise with the original design and character of the house, in terms of scale and roof form, and maintain the common design characteristics of the row or street, in terms of roofline, building pattern (including the "group" effect) and design details. Front extensions may be acceptable if they are fairly small and do not project beyond the front wall of the house in a way that dominates the street scene. Similar policies and design guidance are carried forward to the emerging Dacorum Borough Local Plan (1991-2011) which has been placed on deposit.

The main issue

3. Having seen the site and having read the representations, I consider the main issue raised in this appeal is whether the proposed extension would disrupt the visual continuity of this terrace of houses, spoiling the appearance of the street scene and contrary to the Council's approved design guidance.

Inspector's reasons

4. As I saw on my visit, No. 25 Middleknights Hill is one of a row of terraced houses on the southern side of this residential road. There are similar rows of terraced houses further down and on the opposite side of the road. Apart from the detailed treatment of the porches, windows and front doors, all the houses in this terrace are virtually identical, with two-storeys and a ridged roof. All have front projections on the ground floor with flat roofs, stepped down to reflect the slope of the hill. As the Council says, the character and appearance of this terrace is largely derived from its consistent, uniform design and the visual continuity of the design of the houses, particularly the flat-roofed front extensions.

5. The appeal proposal would result in a much larger extension to the front elevation of this house, projecting beyond the existing front wall of the dwelling and its neighbours by some 2m in depth, more than doubling the depth of the existing front projection along this part of the terrace. In addition, the proposed extension would have a sloping tiled roof instead of the flat roof which currently exists along the length of the terrace.
6. In my view, the proposed extension would introduce discordant and obtrusive features which would be out of keeping with the original character and design of this row of terraced houses, disrupting the visual continuity of the terrace and spoiling the appearance of the street scene. As such, it would not only fail to meet the requirements of Policy 8 and the approved Environmental Guidelines, but could also set an undesirable precedent for other similar extensions which could further erode the uniform character and design of this and other nearby terraces of similar houses.
7. The appellants accept that the appeal property forms part of an established terrace of houses, distinguished by a uniform design, and acknowledge that the proposed extension would project in front of the established building line, changing the street scene. However, I cannot agree that the present appearance of the terrace is bland and uninteresting; it merely reflects the uniformity and consistent design of these former New Town houses. I recognise that the grass verge in front of the terrace might help to offset the forward projection of the proposed extension. Nevertheless, I consider it would represent a substantial and conspicuous addition to the property which, with its sloping roof, would introduce a visually discordant feature, breaking up the uniform design of the original terrace and disrupting rather than enhancing the visual continuity of the street scene.
8. I note that similar extensions have been permitted on the front of other former New Town houses, some of which I saw on my visit. However, the detailed design of the front elevations of these other terraces differs from that of the appeal property, particularly in terms of the uniform flat-roofed front projections. In any event, each proposal has to be considered on its own merits in the light of the relevant policies applying at the time. Consequently, I do not consider that the existence of other extensions sets any precedent or provides any justification for the current proposal, bearing in mind its adverse effect on the street scene.
9. I have considered the points about the feasibility of replacing the sloping roof with a flat roof and I note the discussions (or lack of them) with the Council about possible amendments to the proposal. I also recognise that the extension would be constructed with materials to match those existing. However, none of these factors, nor any of the other points made in the representations, outweigh the main considerations which lead to my conclusions on this appeal.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed and accordingly I shall exercise the powers transferred to me and **dismiss** this appeal.

Stephen J. Pratt

STEPHEN J PRATT