



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/24/3350564

20 Buckwells Field, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 3FF

- 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 and Mrs Robert and Melanie Davies against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref is 3/24/0774/HH.
 - The development proposed is for a one and a half storey side extension with front dormer and rear Juliet balcony.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey home. The front elevation comprises a steeply pitched front gable and subservient side offshoot with a sliding roof to the side. It is the end property in a row of similar dwellings. The uniformity of this row positively contributes to the overall cohesive array of similar aged dwellings of various designs, features, materials and scale. Overall the area has a pleasing and gentle pattern of development, with visual breaks in built form, in a relatively high density development. This is attributable to the carefully designed stepped roof heights and spaces between homes.
4. Policy HOU11 in the East Herts District Plan, adopted 2018 (the District Plan) requires residential extensions to be subservient additions. In addition, it seeks to ensure that side extensions at first floor level or above ensure appropriate space is left between the flank wall of an extension and the common curtilage with a neighbouring property to safeguard the character and appearance of the street scene and prevent a visual terracing effect. As a general rule a space of one metre is the minimum acceptable. District Plan Policy DES4 also seeks a high standard of design.
5. The proposal would mainly introduce development in front of the side offshoot of the existing dwelling. Although brought forward, the proposal would be slightly set back from the front elevation of the appeal property. The increased ridge height would be lower from the main front gable ridge. The resultant steep sliding roof would be larger, but reflective of the current roof arrangement. The proposal has

been designed to be subservient to the existing dwelling. The proposal also seeks to add a front pitched dormer window, of which there are a few examples mainly on taller and different styles of home. The Council has no objection to alteration to the window at the rear, and I have no reason to disagree.

6. However the proposal is sited along the common curtilage boundary. It is reliant on the narrow 1.2m to 1.5m gap afforded to 21 Buckwells Field, rather than space to its own side. Whilst there are existing narrow gaps between homes, the overall scale of the sliding roof, forward projection and introduction of the dormer window would interrupt the predominant pattern of development associated with the similar homes in that small row.
7. The proposal would erode the gap above the host building and the space between built development. The space to the side of No 21 would not be sufficient to prevent the combined mass of the forward projection and dormer window from appearing uncomfortably close to No 21 and cramped within its plot. The proposal would result in a terracing effect, as the loss of space to the side would also harmfully reduce the distinction between the 20 Buckwells Field and No 21. The prominent position of this dwelling would also appearing larger and bulkier, and set at the end of a similar row of properties overall it would result in the proposal appearing incongruous in the street scene.
8. Although the stepped position of homes, and curvature of the road would largely screen the proposal from side angles the appeal property is centrally located in a prominent position along the main access route to many homes and opposite a subsidiary road and it would be highly visible.
9. I conclude that overall the proposal would be harmful to character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the District Plan. Together these seek, amongst other things, a high standard of design including that extensions are appropriate to the character, appearance and setting of the surrounding area reflecting and promoting local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal is contrary to the development plan. I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR