



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2020

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/20/3250631

23 Ormesby Drive, Potters Bar, EN6 3EA

- 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 M Luftig against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1872/HSE dated 22 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that the description of the development stated on the Council's decision notice differs from that stated on the planning application and appeal forms. The Council's description is for a part single, part two storey front extension. I consider this to be more accurate and I have assessed the proposal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and on the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling. It is situated in a residential area, which is typified largely by two-storey semi-detached houses. These are set-back from the road, behind traditional front gardens. The houses vary in terms of their age and style, but a common feature is projecting bay windows at the front. Some dwellings along Ormesby Drive have been extended at the front. However, these are mainly single storey additions that provide entrance porches/lobbies. Two storey front extensions are rare, although the appellant has pointed to such examples in the wider area. The appeal property has already been extended at the rear and within the roof area.
5. The proposal is to enlarge the property at the front by constructing a two-storey extension with a single storey front facing projection. The extension would provide an enlarged entrance area on the ground floor and an enlarged bathroom on the first floor.
6. Policy CS22 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy 2013 and Policy SADM30 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016 seek

(amongst other things) to ensure development is of high-quality design; makes a positive contribution to the area and reflects the character of its surroundings. These policies are consistent with the provisions of paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework). In addition, the Council's Planning and Design Guide – Part E, which relates to residential extensions and alterations, states that front extensions that are larger than a porch will be refused if they stand out as bulky, are out of character or adversely change the appearance of the house and street.

7. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the benefits of the proposal in terms of structural stability, together with the existence of other two storey front extensions in the area. However, there are no other such extensions on Ormesby Drive. I also recognise that there would be benefits in terms of the increase in internal space for the appellant and dependents. Furthermore, the symmetrical appearance between the appeal property and the adjoining semi has been compromised by the construction of a gable roof to replace the original hipped roof.
8. However, in spite of the above, I consider that the appeal proposal would appear incongruous and out of character with both the appeal dwelling and the streetscene, due to its position and overall size and bulk. Its width would also compromise the appearance of the existing curved front ground floor window, which is a feature of the property. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the policies of the Development Plan and associated guidance, as referred to above.

Other Matters

9. I note that concerns were raised by third parties in relation to amenity and car parking provision. However, I have no reason to find against the proposal on these grounds.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR