



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2020

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/W/20/3252370

67 Thornbury Gardens, Borehamwood, Hertfordshire WD6 1RD

- 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 & Mrs D Cutmore against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0176/FUL, dated 4 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "new dwelling 58.85 sqm".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposed new dwelling would be built off the host property, resulting in the pair of semi-detached dwellings at 67 and 69 Thornbury Gardens becoming a terrace of 3 houses. Within the Thornbury Gardens street scene there is a mix of terraced and semi-detached dwellings, with gaps between facing side elevations of neighbouring properties at least at first-floor level.
4. The development proposed would be built up to the side boundary of the site. This adjoins an alleyway and therefore there would be space between the side elevations of the new dwelling and No 65. However, the development would be out of keeping in the street scene due to the first floor being built up to the side site boundary. This would be a prominent aspect when seen from the alleyway and would result in an overbearing impact not in keeping with the typical pattern of development in Thornbury Gardens.
5. Side extensions to semi-detached and end-terrace houses in the street are either a single storey in height, or the first-floor extension is a subordinate feature to the host property. The development proposed would not be a subordinate feature. Although narrower than the host property, it would be level with the front elevation and the ridge height would match that of the existing house. It would unbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings within the street scene. The symmetry of such pairs of houses within Thornbury Gardens has generally been preserved, particularly above ground-floor level.

6. Nos 15 and 20 Thornbury Gardens include first-floor side extensions, but these are set back from the front elevations and set away from the side boundaries to the sites. No 14 does not have a first-floor side extension that was visible from the road. These examples are therefore dissimilar to the appeal proposal, and only attract limited weight in the determination of this appeal. The two-storey side extension granted on appeal in Potters Bar is in a different settlement within the borough, and no details of the context of the surrounding area have been provided. In any case that development included a gap between the side elevation and side boundary. It is dissimilar to the appeal proposal and can only be given limited weight in the determination of this appeal.
7. The development proposed would therefore result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. It conflicts with Policies SP1 and CS22 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy 2013 and Policies SADM3 and SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016. Taken together these state, amongst other things, that development will be permitted provided that it recognises and complements the particular local character of the area in which it is located.

Other matters

8. The development proposed would contribute to the Council's supply of housing. This weighs in favour of the proposed development, but the benefit of a single dwelling is limited and, in this instance, does not outweigh the harm that would result from the appeal proposal.
9. The development proposed would make sufficient provision for parking and refuse storage for the existing and proposed houses on the site forecourt. The absence of harm from this arrangement is a neutral consideration.
10. The appellants have referred to a side extension to the host property for which the Council has granted planning permission. However, the details of that approval have not been submitted so do not attract any weight in the determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR