

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2016

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 15th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/16/3159281

229 Monks Walk, Buntingford, Hertfordshire SG9 9DY

- 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 Tracey Estaves against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/16/1141/HH, dated 12 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid-terrace house. The terrace is formed by four similar houses dating from about the 1960s. The terrace is of plain design and is identified as having little architectural merit by the Council. However, there are several other terraces of similar design nearby and cumulatively they contribute to the character and appearance of the local area.
 4. The proposal is for a single-storey, front extension which would project about two metres from the front of the house and would span across more or less the whole width of the house. The top of the extension's mono-pitch roof would sit just below the first floor windows. Because of its size and bulk in relation to the size of the existing house, the extension would dominate the appearance of the front of the house and it would disrupt the regular, designed appearance of the terrace. In turn this would detract from the cumulative contribution of the terraces of similar design to the character and appearance of the local area. In these respects the proposed porch would not meet with the requirements of Policies ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review.
 5. A similarly sized and designed front extension has been built at Nos 251 and 253 Monks Walk. However, the extension is shared between the two houses and spans about half of the front elevation of each of the two houses. Consequently the extension does not dominate the appearance of either of the two houses to
-

the same extent as the appeal proposal would. Notwithstanding this, the extension built at Nos 251 and 253 does not contribute positively to the appearance of the terrace that the two properties are situated in and it does not provide justification for the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

6. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and it should make places better for people. In this case the appeal property is relatively small and the proposed development would provide useful additional space for the appellant and her family. Also, the use of painted render to clad the external walls of the extension would reflect the appearance of the host building, helping the extension to blend in with the terrace as a whole. However, the size and bulk of the extension would result in harm to the appearance of the terrace and consequently it would detract from the character and appearance of the local area. Therefore, on balance and for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR