
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by D Peppitt BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/20/3244435

8 Cranbrook Close, Ware, Herts SG12 0RQ

- 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 Mrs Ursula Bezer against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/1736/HH, dated 20 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, first floor side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached 2 storey dwelling with a detached garage, towards the end of Cranbrook Close. The host dwelling has an existing ground floor extension. The area is predominately residential and is characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings all of a similar style and design.
4. The proposed development is for the erection of a 2 storey side extension and first floor side and rear extension. The proposal would considerably increase the built form of the host dwelling and would appear as a bulky addition when combined with the existing extension. The proposal would wrap around the host dwelling and the scale and massing of the proposal would not appear subservient.
5. Despite the use of sympathetic material, its set-back from the road and the roof height being lower than the existing dwelling, the proposal would be a dominant and prominent feature. The proposal would be readily visible from parts of the street scene, as well as the neighbouring properties and their gardens. The combination of the scale of the rear addition and the two storey side extension, would add further roof forms to the host dwelling, which would appear as incongruous additions.
6. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character, appearance and integrity of the host

building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I acknowledge that other nearby properties have extensions, however, I did not observe any that had the same design, scale and massing as this proposal.

7. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan (2018). These policies, amongst other things, require extensions to be of a size, scale, mass, form, siting and design, that are appropriate to the character and appearance and setting, of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. Whilst I have given the appellant's personal circumstances careful consideration, I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance¹ that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. I note the appellant has stated that the proposal facilitates elderly accommodation and would be socially inclusive and adaptable for the needs of the current occupier, as well as being flexible to the needs of new occupiers in the future. However, I conclude that this is not a matter which outweighs the significant harm that would be caused by the proposal in respect of the effect on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Therefore, I find that these factors are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

D Peppitt

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph 008 Reference ID 21b-008-20140306 – 'What is a material planning consideration?'