
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

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

Decision date: 27 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/17/3167359
72 Beechwood Avenue, St Albans AL1 4XZ

- 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 Ross Nevin against the decision of St Albans City & District Council.
 - The application Ref: 5/16/3473 dated 21 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor front infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling within a predominantly residential area, mainly comprising semi-detached dwellings from a similar period but of differing detailed designs. The regular spacing of the dwellings and the front projecting bay windows over ground and first floor, albeit of a differing designs, contribute to the character and appearance of this residential area. The property has been previously extended, including with a two storey side and rear extension.
 4. The proposed front infill extension would increase the width of the existing projecting front extension under a hipped roof. The existing front addition is modest in scale and given its scale and form and the intervening porch, does not detract from the characteristic front bay windows at ground and first floor level.
 5. Although the increase in floor area would be relatively small, the effect of the enlarged front extension would, as a result of its increased width and larger hipped roof form, become a dominant and incongruous feature that would overwhelm the form and detailing of the existing dwelling. It would result in a
-

very awkward and unsatisfactory relationship with the existing and characteristic bay window feature.

6. I agree with the Appellant that the surrounding properties have been the subject of a variety of extensions and alterations, but I did not see on my site visit and have not been made aware of any that would be similar in form and detailing to the proposal before me. It is my view, that the dwelling, as proposed to be extended, would appear visually discordant and over prominent in the street scene. As a result, it would harm the character and appearance of the local area.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area. This would conflict with Policies 69 (i) and 72 (i) and (ii) of the St Albans District Local Plan 1994 and the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which, amongst other things, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context and local distinctiveness.
8. The Appellant has referred to other improvements he would wish to make to the fenestration and front elevation as part of the proposed works, but there is nothing before me to suggest that these works would require the front extension to be undertaken. Moreover, these benefits would not outweigh the harm I have concluded.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR