The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2017

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

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

Decision date: 13th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/17/3172464
2 Warenford Way, Borehamwood WD6 5EW

- 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 and Mrs I Shani against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
- The application Ref 17/0146/HSE dated 22 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2017.
- The development proposed is a single storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the terrace of dwellings and surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end-of-terrace property on the corner of Brook Road and Warenford Way. The main road is Brook Road, however, the main frontage of the appeal site is orientated towards Warenford Way, where vehicular access is taken from, and where there is a front porch. The terrace of properties consists in total of 6 dwellings and the other bookend property similar to the appeal site is no.1 Fairburn Close. This latter property has its main frontage facing Fairburn Close.

4. Both the appeal site and no.1 Fairburn Close step back from the main front facades of the dwellings which sit in between them. Those are nos 126, 128, 130 and 132 Brook Road. The proposed development is an extension which would fill in the set-back along the side elevation of the appeal property but only to single storey level. It would front Brook Road. It would have small flat roof and then a pitched roof similar to the pitch on the main dwelling. The adjoining dwelling to the appeal site is no.132 Brook Road and this has a front porch along the common boundary. The proposed development would be flush with the main façade of no.132 Brook Road, as opposed to the front wall of the front porch.

5. Brook Road, as its name suggests, has a watercourse which runs opposite the terrace of properties on the south west side of Brook Road. There is a wide grass verge between Brook Road and the watercourse and there is a recreational footpath on the south west side of the watercourse. There is a footway and grass verge along Brook Road outside the terrace of properties.

6. The two setbacks at each end of the terrace contribute to the character of the terrace. Despite the length of the terrace, the matching setbacks can be appreciated in the streetscene and each are located on corners which turn into minor residential roads, namely Warenford Way and Fairburn Close. To that extent, there is a strong perimeter to the whole terrace and its pleasing symmetry can be perceived from Brook Road and the green space opposite.

7. Whilst the proposed development would be only one storey in height, the extension including its roof would be clearly visible from Brook Road. As it would infill the setback, I have concluded for the reasons identified that it would harm the character and the appearance of the terrace and surrounding area creating a loss of balance and a loss of distinctiveness. The appellant highlights the additions and alterations that have been made to the terrace. For example, the roof of no.126 Brook Road has been tiled with a pinkish-coloured tile and the dwelling has been painted a salmon colour. This creates an unfortunate contrast with the majority of the dwellings in the terrace. However, I do not agree with the appellant that cumulatively the character of the terrace has been weakened by the number and nature of changes made to it to such an extent that the proposal is acceptable.

8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the terrace of properties and the wider streetscene and would be contrary to policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (adopted 2016), policy CS22 of the Hertsmere Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2013) and part E of the Planning and Design Guide SPD (November 2006).

Conclusion

9. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR