
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/19/3243401

The Orchards, Duck Lane, Benington SG2 7LJ

- 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 Chris Caulfield against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/1734/HH, dated 22 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of rear porch and construction of new two storey rear extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The Council granted planning permission for a two-storey rear extension at the appeal property in 2018¹ which is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling on a large plot within a rural location. The site is surrounded by trees and landscaping and is located at the end of a single-track lane, with the side of the property adjacent to Duck Lane. The proposed development includes a two-storey rear extension, projecting from an existing two-storey gable and a first-floor rear extension over an existing single storey lean-to.
6. The proposed two-storey rear extension would have a significant depth of over 6 metres, about some 2 metres longer than the 2018 proposal. Consequently,

¹ 3/18/0962/HH (the 2018 proposal)

it would create a large side elevation wall facing Duck Lane. The existing original gable roof form on this side elevation would remain, however the expansive side elevation of the proposed extension would appear large and imposing in comparison. Although the proposal would use materials which match the host dwelling and follow the design principles of the 2018 proposal, its excessive depth would not result in a subservient addition and would appear disproportionate with the modest and rural appearance of the current property.

7. The front elevation of the dwelling would remain unchanged, however the side and rear elevations are also equally visible from the public realm due to the orientation of the dwelling on the site and gaps within the boundary landscaping. Although additional landscaping may have provided sufficient screening for the 2018 proposal, the current package of works is significantly larger and therefore would have a greater visual impact from the adjacent lane which would be difficult to effectively screen.
8. The proposed first floor extension would not increase the depth of the original dwelling and would be lower in height than the ridge of the existing rear gable, with a matching eaves height. It is noted that the appellant considers the first floor of the property as restrictive and the proposal would provide additional floor area. However, although it would be less visible, the cumulative impact of this alongside the proposed two-storey extension would create an overdeveloped and dominant appearance to the rear of the property which would be out of keeping within the rural surroundings. Although the appeal site is self-contained by hedges and planting, due to its location it would still form part of the rural landscape and the open and spacious nature of the site would contribute to the wider rural character.
9. For the reasons above I consider that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies GBR2, DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan (2018) which collectively seek to ensure extensions to dwellings are appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the site and surrounding area with a high standard of design and generally appear as a subservient addition, along with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has highlighted an approved planning application for two-storey side extension also located on Duck Lane, which is in a Conservation Area and is identified as having similar planning issues to this appeal. No details of the application, apart from a reference number, have been provided and the specific circumstances of this neighbouring development are unknown. However, as it is located within a Conservation Area it would be subject to different considerations and therefore would not be directly comparable to the appeal before me.
11. It is noted that there are no objections to the proposal from third parties. However, this would not outweigh the resultant harm of the proposed development.

Conclusions and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR