



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2024

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/23/3324626

47 Rodgers Close, Hertfordshire, Elstree WD6 3HN

- 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 Noel Dimaculangan against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0290/HSE, dated 18 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is more accurate than that provided on the application form. I also noted the presence of a covered porch area at the site during my visit. However, I must make my decision on the basis of the submitted plans and I have proceeded on this basis.
3. Since the determination of this application, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. I have not sought further submissions on the revised Framework, and am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The site is a two-storey dwelling with modest ground floor bay window with hipped roof in Rodgers Close, at the junction with High Street. The property is staggered, flush with the side elevation of the adjoining property to the south and behind the side elevation of the adjoining property to the north. Rodgers Close features a range of dwellings and porch widths, but properties in the immediate grouping of the site share a commonality in the modest projection and hipped roof of their front porches and bay windows. As such, the property contributes positively to the surrounds due to this consistency.
6. The proposal relates to a single storey front porch, constructed from materials that would assimilate at the dwelling and in the surrounds. While it would span

almost the entire width of the appeal property, given the wider nature of surrounding front projections this alone would not cause undue visual harm.

7. However, although it would be less than half the depth of the dwelling and would retain much of the garden, the proposal would extend much further than the front bay window. This would result in a bulky front elevation with a level of projection that would fail to respect the modest proportions and simple shape of the dwelling. It would also fail to relate to or integrate with surrounding front porches and bay windows. The incongruous nature of the proposal would be further highlighted by its flat roof, which is not a common feature along front elevations in the immediate section of Rodger Close.
8. Planning and Design Guide Part E: Guidelines for Residential Extensions and Alterations 2006 (the SPD) states that front extensions larger than a porch will be refused if they stand out as bulky, out of character or adversely change the appearance of the house or street. Although guidance rather than policy, given my findings this SPD provides support for my conclusion that the proposal would cause undue visual harm due to its bulk and incongruous appearance.
9. The proposal would be largely screened from High Street. However, clear views of it would be possible from Rodgers Close, despite its setback. Rather than visually merging with the wall behind, in the context of surrounding front porches and projections it would read as dominant and out of character. While the appellant has suggested it would potentially be obscured by a side extension at No. 46, there is nothing substantive before me to suggest that this is anything more than a theoretical possibility at this stage.
10. For the reasons given, the proposal would cause significant adverse harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it would fail to comply with Policy CS22 of the Hertsmere Local Plan Development Plan Document Core Strategy 2013, Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Local Plan Site Allocation and Development Management Policies Plan 2016, and the SPD insofar as they seek to ensure high quality design that recognises and complements the character of the area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant states the proposal would provide additional space for residents. However, this is a private benefit that carries limited weight. In addition, while it is not possible to extend to the side or rear of the dwelling and the appellant asserts that the current porch design is of a limited quality, it nevertheless remains that the extension as proposed would result in undue visual harm. Even taken together these points do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR