
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020

by S Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/19/3239121

6 Poplar Close, High Cross SG11 1AY

- 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 C Krauss against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/1238/HH, dated 11 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 6 Poplar Close, High Cross SG11 1AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/19/1238/HH, dated 11 June 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 4751-OS1, 4751-OS3-PLNG and 4751-P01-PLNG.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene; and the effect on the living conditions of occupiers of No 5 Poplar Close, the adjoining property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Poplar Close is a residential cul-de-sac comprising mostly semi-detached and short terraces of two storey houses and bungalows. No 6 is a semi-detached, two-storey house. The houses are of a rather plain design with pitched roofs set back behind front gardens some of which contain off-street parking space. Although there are a variety of facing materials such as brick, render and pebble dash, the properties on Poplar Close are otherwise similar in appearance although a few have front porches of different sizes and styles.

4. The proposed extension would have a pitched roof some 3.1m at the highest point with an eaves' height of about 2.2m. It would project about 1m from the face of the building and be constructed of matching materials. It would span the width of the two storey part of the dwelling but the existing single storey utility to the side would be unaltered. Although wider than other porches along the street this modest extension, due to its size, design and position set back from the highway boundary, would be subservient to the host property and would not be so prominent or out of keeping as to upset the architectural form of the street. Moreover, it would not be dissimilar to front extensions at properties on the nearby North Drive.
5. I conclude the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the host property or the street scene. Accordingly I find no conflict with those aspects of Policies HOU11, VILL2 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 (the DP) which seek to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the local area.

Living Conditions

6. There is a ground floor window in the front wall of No 5 set in a little way from the shared boundary. The proposed extension would adjoin the shared boundary. However, it would project only about 1.5m forward of the front wall and would be to the north-east of the neighbour's window. As the roof would be pitched the height of the side wall of the proposed extension would reduce to about 2.2m at the furthestmost point from the wall. Although the outlook from the window of No 5 would change, taking into account the proposed scale and position, I conclude that the extension would not have such an adverse effect on light and outlook as to justify withholding permission.
7. For these reasons I conclude, on balance, that the proposal would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of occupants of No 5. Accordingly I find no conflict with those parts of Policies VILL2 and DES4 of the DP which seek to avoid a detrimental impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring houses and land.

Conditions

8. As well as the standard condition specifying the time limits for commencement of development compliance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. Materials for external surfaces should match those of the existing building in the interests of the appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

S Harley

INSPECTOR