



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2021

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/21/3272077
67 The Causeway, Potters Bar EN6 5HF

- 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 Stephens against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0062/HSE, dated 31 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a linked detached house, located on the south side of The Causeway, in an area of similarly scaled larger detached and semi-detached houses. These are of individual designs and are set back from the road behind generously proportioned front gardens with driveways. Many of these houses appear to have been the subject of a variety of extensions, including the host dwelling.
4. The proposal is for a first-floor extension that would sit above the ground floor part of a previously approved but apparently only partly implemented extension at the front of the host dwelling.
5. The proposed extension would align with the front and side elevations of the existing ground floor porch and downstairs WC. This would create an additional bedroom and separate storage room, extending the first floor forward of the main elevation in this area, which would be topped by a crown roof. The proposed roof would be further forward and substantially shorter than the existing first floor roof forms and would be a prominent addition to the front of the host dwelling.
6. The existing part gable front and characterful porch design present a well-balanced composition of forms to the front of the host dwelling as it addresses The Causeway. The proposed extension would absorb and alter the porch, diminishing the contribution this makes to the architectural quality of the host

dwelling. Due to the scale of the proposal and the squat appearance of its crown roof form, the proposal would be a bulky addition.

7. Overall, the proposed extension would contrast unsympathetically with the design of the host dwelling and would, thereby, adversely affect its appearance and character.
8. Notwithstanding that the host dwelling sits behind a tall hedge, it is visible through the driveway opening onto The Causeway and its architectural quality currently adds considerably to character and appearance of the local area. The bulky appearance of the proposed extension would, therefore, be immediately apparent in views of the host dwelling from the street and in views within and of the local area.
9. The bulky appearance of the proposal would result in an extension that would neither appear sympathetic in design nor be a subordinate addition to the host dwelling. This would cause significant harm to its character and appearance and that of the local area, contrary to Policy CS22 of the Hertsmere Core Strategy 2013, Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, Hertsmere's Planning Design Guide Part E 2006 and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These collectively seek developments that are of high-quality design that respect, enhance or improve the visual amenity of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other various first floor extensions to nearby properties. These would have been considered on their own individual merits, a principle that underpins the planning system and I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal and have, therefore, afforded these little weight.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR