



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2024

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N1920/D/24/3339972

33 The Shrublands, Potters Bar, Hertfordshire, EN6 2BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Peter Louca against the decision of Hertsmere Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/1690/HSE.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. There is a front extension in place at the appeal property. This structure projects some 2.7 metres beyond the main front elevation. There is a planning permission in place for a front extension of similar appearance, but with a projection of only 2 metres. The current proposal relates to the 2.7 metre deep projection that is already constructed and which, therefore, has the nature of a retrospective application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area along The Shrublands.

Reasons

4. No 33 is a semi-detached house situated on the south side of The Shrublands. The dwelling has a parking area to the front, and an existing single-storey front extension with a front gable roof over the porch part and a mono-pitch roof over the other part. The main roof of the house is hipped. The dwelling is set back on its plot and the front elevation of the extension is approximately level with the front elevation of the neighbouring No 35, but a little over 1 metre behind the front of the adjacent garage.
5. Policy SADM30 of the Hertsmere Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan (LP) states that development which complies with the policies in the Plan will be permitted provided it makes a positive contribution to the built environment; recognises and complements the particular local character of the area in which it is located; and results in a high quality design. It must respect, enhance or improve the visual amenity of the area by virtue of its scale, mass, bulk, and height.

6. The Hertsmere Planning and Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that front extensions that are larger than a porch will be refused if they stand out as bulky, out of character or adversely change the appearance of the house and street.
7. The appellant has made reference to other houses along the road that have front extensions, including No 36 opposite and No 50 a little further to the west. I note these examples but both appear to have a depth of no more than two metres, and both have hipped roofs, while in the case of No 50 the extension does not project beyond the main elevation and bay window at the front of the house. Neither of these extensions are prominent in the street scene and neither appears bulky or out of character with its immediate surroundings.
8. The appellant also contends that the existing extension at No 33 does not project beyond the garage at No 35 and is, consequently, part obscured by that structure. I acknowledge that the front elevation of the extension is behind the front line of the garage. However, the garage is low with a flat roof and the porch component of the extension has a high gable front and is positioned centrally within the front elevation of the house. This, coupled with the significant depth of the extension, renders it a highly prominent and bulky feature which is visible within the street scene when approaching from each direction. Because of its scale and design it appears out of character with both the host property and the streetscape along this part of The Shrublands.
9. In conclusion, I find that the front extension appears as a bulky, prominent feature in the street scene, which is out of character with the appearance of the house and its immediate surroundings. By virtue of its scale and position, it does not respect, enhance or improve the visual amenity of the area. It does not represent high quality design within its immediate context. On this basis, it conflicts with Policy SADM30 of the LP and with guidance in the SPD, Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR