



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2021

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B1930/D/21/3282547
22 Blueberry Close, St Albans AL3 6NH

- 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 Vishal Bhurtun against the decision of St Albans City and District Council.
 - The application Ref 5/21/1385, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The proposed development is for proposed two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a part of a relatively unusually designed collection of houses that utilise similar architectural devices of long, low pitched roofs and what I consider could be vernacular inspired modern forms of domestic architecture. The properties are for the most part in terrace blocks with staggered building lines and a subtle hierarchy in elevational detail. The roofs extend to ground floor level on several properties before setting back at intervals revealing first floor windows.
4. The appeal property itself is located within the cul de sac that is Blueberry Close and forms the end terrace property within one of these blocks of houses. As mentioned above there is some subtle diversity within the streetscene where some properties either protrude forward or backward of the building line and where some are rendered thereby offering something of a contrast to the predominant material of brick.
5. The proposal before me wishes to extend the two storey element of the building forward to bring it in line with the protruding catslide type roof over the ground floor part of the house. In so doing the proposal would somewhat alter the rhythm of the block of houses to which it belongs and introduce a larger, protruding element with a hipped roof to its front.

6. In assessing this appeal, I consider that there the diversity within the streetscene could allow some highly contextual extensions to be successful. Similarly, I appreciate that some architectural cues have been taken from the original design of the houses in the form of the proposed extension. Despite this however, the proposal, through protruding forward at such scale with the rather narrow and contrived hipped roof to the front, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing houses and the streetscene here.
7. Whilst I consider that there could be ways to extend this property without causing such harm, the proposal before me would begin to undermine what I consider is a defining element of the design intent here. As such I consider the proposal would be contrary to Policies 69 and 72 of the St Albans District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework, both of which seek to achieve proposals that are of high quality design and that respond well to the character and appearance of an area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR