



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by C Beeby BA (Hons) MIPROW

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/20/3245711

15 Bentley Road, Hertford, Herts

- 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 Ralph Wrangles against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/2361/HH, dated 18 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey front extension at 15 Bentley Road, Hertford, Herts, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/19/2361/HH dated 18 November 2019, 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: Location Plan, 62-19.1 and 62-19.2.
 - 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 Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached property which is reasonably well set back from the residential street on which it lies. There is some variation in the building line on this side of Bentley Road as a result of the slight curve of the road at this point.
4. Some side or front extensions to properties in the area are evident. These include two-storey front extensions to some of the dwellings on the adjacent Calton Avenue, which is a street of a similar appearance. As a result of several such extensions, the area is partially characterised by examples of modest divergence from the relatively uniform appearance of dwellings as originally built. The use of matching materials and a scale which is subservient to the

existing dwelling ensure that such extensions are not unduly prominent within the street scene.

5. The scale of the two-storey built form of the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour is substantial, so that the proposed extension would have a comparatively modest projection from the front of the dwelling. The extension would be relatively unobtrusive in views travelling west along the street as a result of its set back position and modest scale. It would generally be set against the building and its attached dwelling in views travelling east due to the variable building line of the row. The proposal would be constructed of materials to match those of the existing building, so that its appearance would be in keeping with the relatively uniform original materials of built form in the area.
6. The proposal would consequently form a further suitable example of a modest divergence from the original appearance of dwellings in the vicinity, and as such it would accord with the existing pattern of development. As a result of the above factors the proposal would avoid undue prominence within the street scene, and the pair of semi-detached dwellings would retain acceptable proportions.
7. Thus, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The scheme consequently complies with Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan (2018), which require such proposals to be appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and to reflect and promote local distinctiveness.

Other Matter

8. I note the concerns of an interested party regarding the potential effect of the scheme on a wall to the front of the building, however, these are not matters for this appeal, which I have determined on its planning merits.

Conditions

9. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.
10. A condition in respect of materials is necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Beeby

INSPECTOR