



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1850/D/25/3368041

3 Stopford Close, Hereford, Herefordshire, HR1 1TW

- 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 & Mrs K Davies against the decision of Herefordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 250467.
 - The development proposed is Proposed extensions (at first floor level) and balcony to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and,
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring houses.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Stopford Close is a small cul-de-sac off Vineyard Road at the edge of the Hampton Park Conservation Area (CA). The appeal property is located at the end of the Close and is one of 4 detached relatively modern houses set back from the road edge behind large, paved drives with planted edges.
4. House sizes and designs vary. Although the appeal property appears to have the widest frontage, it has a varied roof form and building line. The central section of the house is recessed with an attached double garage projecting forward of it on one side, and a 2-storey wing projecting forward on the other side, with an attached single storey element. The roof pitch is shallower on the central section and continues down over the garage. The adjoining 2 storey wing has a shorter steeper pitched roof, the angle of which is reflected in the lower single storey side element, although the roofs are not connected. These elements break up the mass of the house and give it a distinct character.
5. The proposal is to add first floor extensions to each side of the house. The single pitched roofs above the garage and side wing would be replaced with dual pitched roofs and gable ends. It would result in a significantly bulkier form, which the

original design sought to prevent, substantially altering the roof which contributes to its distinctive design. In so doing it would harm both the character and appearance of the house, and thus Stopford Close, and conflict with Policies LD1 and SD1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2015) (CS) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) which require high quality design which maintains the character of the area and ensures that distinctive features of existing buildings are safeguarded.

Living conditions

6. The proposed first floor balcony would be at the end of the house furthest from 4 Stopford Close such that views from it towards No 4's garden would be at an oblique angle and at a distance that would avoid a significant loss of privacy. It would face towards the rear gardens of houses that back onto to Clyst Lane, which runs along the rear of the house, and an overgrown area of open space to the side. The distance to the rear gardens is enough, in combination with the height of their boundary walls, to ensure that there would be no harm to the privacy of occupants of those properties.
7. The proposal would add a rear window closer to the boundary with No 4, and a side window facing 2 first floor side windows at No 4. The side window would serve an ensuite bathroom. A planning condition requiring obscured glazing could prevent any mutual overlooking between it and the side windows at No 4. Due to the orientation of the appeal property, the proposed rear window would be slightly angled away from No 4, preventing any views into No 4s windows or direct views into its rear garden, as is the case with the existing windows at the appeal property. There would be sideways views across part of the garden closest to the boundary fence, but the potential for overlooking would not be significantly greater than already exists. The proposed development therefore complies with Policies LD1 and SD1 of the CS and the Framework insofar as they seek to protect residential amenity.

Other Matters

8. The council considered that the proposal would preserve the CA because of its position set back away from the main CA, restricting views of the property, and because the modern design of the houses contribute little to the special interest of the CA. I agree with that assessment.
9. I have had regard to the examples of other extensions approved by the council nearby, provided by the appellant. None of those houses had the distinct roof profile that I have identified as important to the character of the appeal property, which would be lost as a result of the proposed development. As such they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
10. I have considered all other matters raised in support of the appeal, including the improvements to the living space and energy performance of the building. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm and conflict with policy that I have identified.
11. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the council's administration of correspondence related to the appeal. However, procedural issues such as this must remain a matter between the main parties. More particularly, my remit is

limited to assessing the planning merits and impacts of the proposed development, and I have reached my decision on this basis.

12. Neighbours' concerns over the impact of noise during construction do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR