



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 January 2021

by Chris Forreth MRTPI, DipTP, BSc(Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/20/3258572
8 Farm Close, Ware, Hertfordshire SG12 7SQ

- 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 Michael Payne against the decision of East Herts District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/20/1055/HH, dated 5 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a corner plot on a modern housing estate and consists of a two and half storey property with a front porch. To the side of the property is an area of garden land beyond which is the road. Alongside the rear garden there is a small area of landscaping and an area of car parking parallel to the side garden wall.
4. Given the corner location of the plot, and the siting of the proposed extension, it would be highly visible in the streetscene. However, this does not automatically result in a proposal being unacceptable.
5. At my site visit I saw that the immediate area of the appeal site is densely developed with limited landscaping to the properties fronting onto the site. I also noted that this area was dominated by the roadway and parking facilities. Therefore, the limited areas of landscaping which do exist form an important element of soft relief to the otherwise hard, built form.
6. That said, the parts of the extension alongside the existing property would only result in the loss of a grassed area and an area with low level planting. Taking this into account, this part of the proposal would not result in a significant change in the character of the streetscene. It is also significant that there would still be some soft landscaping in the streetscene at this point as a result of the retention of the existing hedge planting alongside the carriageway.

7. However, the extension would also extend beyond the rear wall of the existing dwelling. Unhelpfully, the plans submitted with the application do not accurately reflect the existing situation as they do not show the landscaped area between the rear access path and the parking space to the side, nor do they accurately reflect the alignment of the road.
8. The proposal would result in the relocation of the pathway and garden gate and the loss of the landscaped area between the parking space and the path. Given the limited amount of landscaping in this area I consider that this loss, in combination with the loss of the area to the side of the house itself, would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the streetscene which already suffers from limited soft landscaping.
9. For the above reasons the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 which amongst other matters seek to ensure that all development is of a high standard of design which reflects the character and appearance of the area, including landscaping of the site.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR