

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2017

by Clive Tokley MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/16/3161950
40 Burnside, St. Albans, AL1 5RT.

- 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 Mark Fluckiger-Paine against the decision of St Albans City Council.
 - The application Ref 5/16/2626 dated 22 August 2016 was refused by notice dated 17 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey front extension and alterations to front and rear openings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the front extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No 40 Burnside lies within a terrace of 7 similarly-designed two-storey dwellings within an extensive residential area. The terrace comprises dwellings on an "L" shaped plan with single-storey front projections under "catslide" roofs with low front eaves. Some of these front projections are double-width serving two dwellings and this arrangement occurs at No 40 where the projection is shared with No 39. The Burnside cul-de-sac is fronted by several short terraces of a similar design to that hosting No 40 and the forward projections and small courtyards between them result in a distinctive rhythm throughout the close. At my site visit I noted that similar terraces front a number of nearby streets, including Buttermere Close, Keswick Close, Staveley Court and Richard Stagg Close.
 4. The appellant refers to a number of extensions in the area and has submitted a photograph showing a lean-to infill extension to a house of similar design to the appeal dwelling. However no addresses have been supplied. I cannot claim to have carried out an exhaustive survey of dwellings of this type but none that I saw in the streets near the appeal property had been extended in the way indicated in the photograph.
-

5. The dwellings in the terrace containing the appeal property have open, mainly paved, front garden areas divided by low wooden fences. This results in the form of the dwellings being clear to see from the road. No 40 is close to a right-angled bend in Burnside and the open frontages and small green area opposite result in the front of the terrace being prominently in view when approaching along Burnside from the north east.
6. The design approach adopted by the appellant would enable the vertical wall of the first floor to be seen and the proposal would reflect the materials and roof slope of the original dwelling. However the proposal would result in an almost continuous roof plane extending over half way up the catslide roof across the gap separating the dwellings.
7. This residential area has no special designation; however terraces of the type that includes the appeal property are characteristic of the area. As a result of its location and context the form of the terrace is clearly apparent. I consider that the front extension would upset the distinctive rhythm of the terrace and would materially detract from the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with saved policies 69 and 72 of the *St Albans District Local Plan Review* (1994). It would also conflict with the *National Planning Policy Framework* which indicates that high quality design should always be sought and that it is proper to seek to reinforce local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

8. I have had regard to the photograph submitted by the appellant showing an infill extension to a similar dwelling but my determination of this appeal is based on the specific circumstances and location of the appeal property. Taking account of all matters I have concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

Clive Tokley

INSPECTOR