
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/K1935/D/25/3358354

7 Milestone Close, Stevenage SG2 9RR

- 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 Dean Smith and Ms Emma Jones against the decision of Stevenage Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00469/FPH.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a two-storey end terrace dwelling, sited within a triangular shaped plot. The terrace comprises four dwellings and retains its original basic symmetry, with any extensions discreetly located to the rear. This balanced appearance is also a key feature of many of the neighbouring terraces, and positively contributes to the character of the area.
5. The property's gable end elevation contains a small mono-pitch porch and faces onto a communal car park which is accessed from a branch of Milestone Close. This elevation is visible from this section of Milestone Close as well as from Edmunds Drive immediately beyond the parking area. The property's north elevation, together with adjacent terraces, faces onto an area of amenity open space, whilst the rear garden is enclosed by close boarded fencing.
6. The proposed single storey addition would extend across most of the dwelling's exposed gable end fronting the car park. Designed with a crown roof, its depth would narrow from the rear back towards the porch, onto which it would attach, following the parameters of the site as defined by the boundary. Whilst it would be built in matching materials, owing to this irregular shaped footprint, substantial overall mass, and a contrasting roof construction to the main and porch roofs, the

extension would disrupt the simple existing proportions and form of the dwelling. The awkward intersection of the development with the porch would furthermore contribute to its appearance as an unsympathetic addition to the building.

7. The main parties are in dispute over whether the proposal is a front or side extension to the dwelling. However, irrespective of its classification, by virtue of a combination of its incongruous design and positioning on the gable end, the development would harmfully unbalance the terrace as a whole, in doing so diminishing its essentially symmetrical form. In addition, the extension would be particularly conspicuous in the locality given the prominence of the elevation to which it would adjoin. Accordingly, its apparent incompatibility with the host building is such that the proposal would fail to have proper regard to its situation and surroundings and would not constitute a high quality of design.
8. On this basis, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies SP8 and GD1 of the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011-2031. These policies together set out requirements for new development to be of the highest standards of design, including by respecting and positively contributing to its location and surrounds and through having regard to the Stevenage Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2025 (the SPD). Furthermore, the extension would fail to comply with Principles HD1 and HD2 of the SPD, which provide that householder developments should be designed so that their form and scale is respectful of the original property and surroundings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR