



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/22/3306985

62 Hazeldell, Watton at Stone, Hertfordshire SG14 3SW

- 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 S Coulson against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/22/1194/HH, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front extension and existing flat roof to be replaced with a pitched roof to match adjacent property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The proposed development includes a single storey front extension to a semi-detached dwelling situated within a predominantly residential area. Within the surrounding area there are variations to the style and design of the dwellings, including some possessing single storey porches, small extensions to their front elevations and garages which project further forward than the main elevations. However, 64 and 66 Hazeldell which are sited forward of the appeal property.
4. The proposed extension would not project further forward than the front elevation of No. 64 and in distant views would be seen against the context of this neighbouring property's side elevation. However, the appeal scheme's projection from the property's front elevation would be significantly greater than porches, extensions and garage projections associated with other dwellings fronting Hazeldell.
5. By reason of its siting and scale, the proposed front extension would be a conspicuous and incongruous addition to the host property which would not be subservient to its size and form. Instead, the appeal scheme would visually and physically dominate the host property's front elevation. Further, the siting of the proposed extension would disrupt the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. The use of external materials that would match the host property would not mitigate this unacceptable harm.

6. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with the design requirements of Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan (DP). Amongst other matters, these policies require development to respect, and be appropriate to, the character of the site, the surrounding area and the setting of the existing dwelling. No conflict has been identified with DP Policy VILL1 because of the varying character of the village but this does not alter the conclusion that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR