



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/21/3288184
32 Cardinal Avenue, Borehamwood WD6 1EP

- 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 Edward O'Grady against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/1934/HSE, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is an office extension above existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a 2-storey semi-detached house. It is on a street characterised by a regular pattern of semi-detached dwellings. Many of the houses appear to have been subject of alterations and front extensions. However, these have mainly been single storey and there is a general consistency to the 2 storey bay windows which are a prominent and positive feature within the street scene. Also, the general symmetry within the pairs of semi-detached dwellings has been relatively well preserved.
4. The development would have a hipped roof and a ridge height lower than that of the original dwelling. It would also have matching materials and the same footprint as the original porch. Nevertheless, it would be 2 storey and extend further forward than the existing gable, and as a result it would dominate the front gable and result in the loss of the prominence of the attractive first floor bay window feature. Its bulk would also unbalance and result in the loss of symmetry between the pair of properties it forms part of. Given the position of the extension it would dominate the property and be incongruous with the predominant pattern of development in the street, where front extensions are generally single storey and subordinate to the bay windows. Whilst visually localised in extent, the development would diminish the character and design quality of the host dwelling, with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. I have had regard to the presence of other properties within the area which appear to have been subject of 2-storey front extensions. Numbers 46 and 48

Cardinal Avenue both retain their symmetry as a pair of houses and are located within a different part of the street scene, and the distinctive first floor front gable is retained at 49 Cardinal Avenue. Whilst the appellants have drawn my attention to additional examples of extensions, I don't have full details of these properties, and none directly replicate the proposed scheme.

6. The development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies SP1 and CS22 of Hertsmere Local Plan Core Strategy and Policy SADM30 of The Hertsmere Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan, which require development to be of a high quality of design that respects, enhances or improves the character of an area. It would also be contrary to The Planning and Design Guide Part E: Guidelines for Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document which seeks to prevent front extensions which would alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Finally, the development would also be contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework where it states that developments should add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive.

Other Matters

7. Even if I were to agree that the proposal would not result in any unacceptable effects upon living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, this is a neutral factor.
8. The site is well located in relation to services and facilities and that alterations and extensions to houses in such locations can help to support a growing population and ensure that houses provide flexibility to meet peoples changing needs. Car parking provision would not be affected by the development. These considerations do not alter my decision, however.

Conclusion

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

V Simpson

INSPECTOR