The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2020

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/20/3253004
69 Pinewood Close, Borehamwood, Herts WD6 5NP

- 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 Alison Hall against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
- The application Ref 20/0194/HSE, dated 10 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2020.
- The development proposed is described as a 2 storey side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey house set within a residential area of similar properties. The house forms part of a terrace of 4 houses wherein the middle 2 houses have their entrances on the main elevation facing the road and the end houses have their entrances on the end elevation.

4. There is some debate in the appeal documents about whether the extension should be seen as a front extension or a side extension. The appellant and the Council differ in their opinions, which then leads to different considerations in relation to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Planning and Design Guide. Although I do not see it as essential to come to a firm conclusion on this matter, it seems to me that the Council's guidance in the SPD on side extensions is perhaps more relevant to this proposal than that which relates to front extensions.

5. The proposed 2 storey extension would measure 4m in width and around 6.7m in depth. It would be wider than the front elevation of the existing house and would represent a significant addition to this modest dwelling, which would more than double its floorspace.

6. Policies SP1 and CS22 of the Core Strategy (CS) and Policy SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (SADMPP) require new development to be of high quality and design. Policy SADM30 states that new development should also make a positive contribution to the built environment.

The Council's SPD indicates that extensions such as this should appear secondary to the original house and the width should be significantly less than the house, amongst other things. In my judgement, the proposal would fail to appear as a subservient addition to this house and would visually overwhelm it.

7. I have taken account of the siting of the house at the end of this terrace which faces away from Pinewood Close. However, I consider that the proposed extension would be readily visible and views would be easily gained from the adjacent pedestrian route.

8. As a result of my findings, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the locality and would be contrary to the policies and SPD as set out above. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR