



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/19/3229559

2 Winters Lane, Walkern, Hertfordshire SG2 7NZ

- 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 & Mrs Steve & Gabi Tankel against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/0152/HH, dated 25 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached residential dwelling located within the Walkern Conservation Area (CA) As identified in the Walkern CA Character Appraisal and management proposal there are a number of farms and fields which are interspersed within the built-up areas of the village. This is a particularly special characteristic of the CA which, along with other aspects such as historic building, narrow lanes and mature landscaping, show the evolution of the settlement.
4. The building at the appeal site is a more modern property, its low-level horizontal nature, along with landscaping to the site frontage and boundaries, ensure its built form is largely screened from the surrounding area. This screening and the verdant character of the site result in the site overall having a neutral impact on the CA.
5. Although the extension would not increase the footprint of the existing building it would result in an extensive flank wall to the side boundary in addition to a substantial roof addition. The extension would not be subservient to the existing dwelling or respect its existing size and design, with eaves and ridge height both higher than the existing.
6. The height, design and overall bulk of the extension would also result in it being a prominent feature, in particular on the approach to the site from High Street. Due to the proximity of the existing garage to the site boundary the

landscape screening here is limited and the extension would be a clearly visible and dominant feature.

7. The development would introduce a prominent and urbanising extension which would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. I consider this would result in harm to the CA neither preserving or enhancing its verdant character and appearance.
8. The proposal would therefore have a negative effect on the significance of the CA the result would be "less than substantial" harm when considered in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. Whilst I note the appellant's requirements for the extension to be of a certain size and design, I am mindful that these benefits would be personal to the appellant. There would be no public benefit arising from the proposal that would outweigh the harm I have identified above and to which I have attached considerable importance and weight.
10. Therefore, for the reasons stated the development would be contrary to Policies HOU11, DES4, HA1 and HA4 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 and Policies 3 & 12 of the Walkern Parish Neighbourhood Plan, which seek to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the existing property and that development reflects and preserves the special interest and appearance of the CA.

Other Matters

11. It is acknowledged that there were no neighbour objections submitted to the original planning application, however this does not lead me to a different conclusion.
12. On my visit I viewed the residential development on the opposite side of Winters Lane referred to by the appellant. I have not been provided with the details on this development though I did note it is set back from the highway and well screened by substantial landscaping, particularly on the approach from High Street. This development does therefore not affect my consideration of the impacts of the development before me which, as detailed above, I have found to be out of keeping with the existing dwelling and subsequently result in harm to the CA.

13. Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR