

6. Appeals

A. LODGED

None

B. WITHDRAWN

None

C. FORTHCOMING INQUIRIES

None

D. FORTHCOMING HEARINGS

4/00365/15/FUL BRAYBEECH HOMES LTD - MR S BOOTH
CONSTRUCTION OF TWO SEMI-DETACHED HOUSES
LAND TO THE REAR OF 17 STATION ROAD, TRING, HP235NG
[View online application](#)

E. DISMISSED

4/01879/14/LBC MR & MRS BROWNE
CONSTRUCTION OF FRONT PORCH
STUART HOUSE, FERRERS HILL FARM, PIPERS LANE,
MARKYATE, ST. ALBANS, AL3 8QG
[View online application](#)

The appeal was dismissed. The Inspector considered that the proposed porch would have unacceptable impact to the listed building due to the arched canopy and supports detracting from the balance and proportions of the front of the building.

4/03547/14/RET Mr Millar
RETENTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION
22 COOMBE GARDENS, BERKHAMSTED, HP4 3PA
[View online application](#)

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The works which are the subject of the appeal have already been undertaken and I had the benefit of seeing them at my site visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the extension on the character of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this 2 storey semi-detached house set within a road of very similar properties. All of the original pairs of houses have roofs with a ridge running parallel with the frontage, with side gables. I noted that a number of houses in Coombe Gardens have been the subject of alterations, some to the front and involving porches.

5. Policy CS12 of the Council's Core Strategy requires that development should, amongst other things, avoid visual intrusion, should integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of layout, scale and bulk.
6. The porch projects from the front elevation of the house by around 3m and its width is said to be 2.5m. At this point, this is about half the distance of the main elevation from the road. The porch has a pitched roof with the ridge running front to back, presenting a gable to the road.
7. Due to the size and design of the original house, I consider that the porch represents an obvious addition to it. Its projection from the face of the building is significant when compared to the distance that the house is set from the front boundary of the plot. The porch appears to be a poorly conceived after-thought which has little regard to the existing house or the space to its front. Its proximity to the road means that it is highly prominent in the street-scene and its negative effects are heightened.
8. The appellant sets out the need for the extension and refers to local support for it. Whilst I have noted these points, the local support does not outweigh my concerns in relation to the unacceptable effects of the extension. Whilst I recognise the appellant's stated need for the extension, it is likely that the extension would remain long after the appellant's need has ceased to be relevant; in this case his personal circumstance do not outweigh the more general planning considerations.
9. I have closely examined other relevant extensions in Coombe Gardens. I find that most are far less intrusive than the appeal scheme; mainly as a result of their considerably lesser depth and also due to most of them having roof pitches which align with that on the main part of the house. In this respect, I do not find that any of the nearby extensions compel me to look favourably on the appeal scheme.
10. As a consequence of my consideration of these matters, I find that the extension is visually intrusive, it fails to integrate with the streetscape character and does not respect adjoining properties in terms of layout, scale and bulk. Therefore, the extension is contrary to the aims of Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy and I find that there are no other matters which are sufficient to outweigh this harm.
11. Taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the extension is unacceptable for the reasons set out above. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F. ALLOWED

None