
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/22/3297449

16 Revels Road, Hertford, SG14 3JU

- 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 & Mrs I Reynolds against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/21/2751/HH, dated 26 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor extension above part of the existing single-storey side accommodation.
-

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 existing building and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a residential area comprising mostly semi-detached properties of some variety, but with many of an equivalent age, type and appearance to No 16 and its attached neighbour at No 18. Despite the variety between some, and alterations and changes to many properties over time, including the appeal property, I found there to be a pleasing cohesion to the character of the area that remains dominant and which is derived through a general sense of uniformity in scale and appearance between individual house types and complementary use of materials.
4. No 16 occupies a triangular-shaped corner plot with a wide frontage to Revels Road and little depth to the rear garden. It has been significantly altered beyond its original form with a single-storey side extension that wraps around the front elevation to incorporate an entrance porch, and a recently completed hip-to-gable change with a 'box-like' dormer covering the majority of the rear roof slope which I understand was completed as permitted development without the express need to obtain planning permission from the Council. Due

to its slightly elevated levels relative to the road and its openly exposed side elevation, the property appears fairly prominent within the street scene. As a semi-detached pair, Nos 16 and 18 stand out as different to the architecture immediately surrounding along this part of Revels Road, but they are not disassociated with the wider estate which includes many properties that are of similar age and style, including 40 Parker Avenue which is in very close proximity and visual association, all of which contribute to the area's character.

5. The proposal would add a first-floor extension to the side over the existing extension and recessed marginally behind the front elevation and significantly so behind the rear elevation, with a hipped roof over.
6. The extensions that have already been completed at the appeal property undeniably unbalance the appearance of this semi-detached pair, with No 18 retaining its original form. However, especially when seen head-on from Revels Road, they maintain a reasonably acceptable sense of proportion and scale that enables the building to appear comfortable within its surroundings.
7. The first-floor side extension would add noticeable bulk to the existing building in a form that in my assessment would appear poorly executed and with little respect shown to the scale, appearance or architectural composition of the original, which I find would appear distorted and out of proportion. Whilst I accept that the extension would display a degree of subservience to the host dwelling, it would contribute to an amalgam of additions that would show little harmony with each other. The result would be a dwelling lacking in cohesion and one that would be out of keeping and harmful to the established character and appearance of the area. As such, there would be conflict with part (a) of Policy HOU11 *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings, Residential Outbuildings and Works Within Residential Curtilages* of the East Herts District Plan 2018 insofar as it requires extensions to be appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the existing dwelling and/or the surrounding area, and with Policy DES4 *Design of Development* which requires all development to be of a high standard of design and layout in order to reflect and promote local distinctiveness.
8. I have noted and seen for myself the examples given by the appellants where other similar properties in the area have been extended to the side. Those at 9 and 43 Parker Avenue both have hipped roof side additions, but when seen in the round, they both respect the architectural form of the original building by matching the roof style and appearing as extensions that are well-related to the host dwelling. The same is true at Nos 1 and 4 Revels Road. Although I accept that the proportions of the dwellings have been enlarged in each of these cases, the resulting discordant and incohesive combined form of the extensions at No 16 would result in a building demonstrably out of keeping.
9. I appreciate the appellants' efforts to try to overcome the reasons for refusal of an earlier proposed scheme, which was appealed and dismissed in October 2020 (appeal ref: APP/J1915/D/20/3255457), and I recognise that part of the works that were considered at that time have now been lawfully implemented. However, this does not alter my findings that the proposed side extension would add to the property in a manner that would be harmful to its character and appearance and the wider street scene. The appellants' need to provide

additional accommodation to support their family is noted but this need does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR