



## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 14 September 2021

**by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27<sup>th</sup> September 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/20/3255452**

**7 Page Road, Hertford, SG13 7JN**

- 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 Mrs Williams against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
  - The application Ref 3/20/0839/HH, dated 30 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2020.
  - The development proposed is a single storey link extension between dwelling and outbuilding.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey link extension between dwelling and outbuilding at 7 Page Road, Hertford, SG13 7JN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/20/0839/HH dated 30 April 2020 and the plans numbered 2464-01, 2464-02, 2464-03, 2464-04 and 2464-05.

### Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit the extension was substantially complete on site. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. I have taken the description of the development from the appeal form as it is a more precise description of the development.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

5. The extension is a single-storey structure connecting the original dwellinghouse to an outbuilding for which planning permission was previously granted. The extension is set down from the host dwelling due to the change in ground level to the rear of the house. While the extension can be seen from neighbouring properties, it is not prominently visible in the wider area. As seen from Clyde Terrace it is a modest and subordinate structure, set well behind the neighbouring houses, and is not harmful to the street scene.
6. The UPVC cladding used on the walls of the extension is also present on the face of the rear dormer window to the house. The exposed brickwork, doors and windows otherwise match those used in the house and approved outbuilding. Given the relatively small size of the extension, it does not appear

out of keeping in the area, and the joining of the dwellinghouse to the outbuilding is not harmful given its limited visibility.

7. The extension does not therefore result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it accords with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018 which collectively require that extensions and alterations to dwellings be of a size, scale, mass, form, siting, design and materials of construction that are appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the existing dwelling and/or the surrounding area, and extensions should generally appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling.

#### *Other Matters*

8. The extension has connected the host dwelling to the approved outbuilding, allowing easier access for the occupants. This may result in the former outbuilding being used more frequently, but there is no evidence that this is anything other than an extension of the domestic use of the property.
9. Planning permission was not refused by the Council on the grounds of impact to neighbouring trees. There is no evidence before me to indicate that the extension has caused harm or will cause harm to any trees on neighbouring properties.

#### **Conditions**

10. As the extension has already been built no conditions are necessary in this instance.

#### **Conclusion**

11. There are no material considerations to indicate that this appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the appeal succeeds.

*M Chalk*

INSPECTOR