
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Philip Major BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/16/3160716

6 Proctors Way, Bishops Stortford, Hertfordshire CM23 3HE.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Adrian Walker against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref: 3/16/1021/HH, dated 26 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof space conversion with dormer windows to front and rear elevations and ground floor entrance porch with wc.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The Council is not contesting the proposed development so far as the rear facing dormer window is concerned as it is treated as being capable of construction as permitted development. I also note that the porch extension is under construction. I therefore concentrate in this decision on the development which would involve change to the front roof slope of the dwelling.
 4. Proctors Way is a street made up almost entirely of semi-detached houses. Some of the houses have been altered but they retain a coherence of form and style, for the most part with plain front roof slopes facing the street. The proposal would depart from this established character by introducing a large rectangular dormer in the roof. It would extend across about half the roof and almost reach ridge height so that it would be particularly prominent and incongruous. The presence of roadside trees would do little to mitigate the clear views of the structure and the fact that the proposed windows line up vertically would not lessen the bulk and shape of the dormer.
 5. I have taken account of the properties cited which have roof alterations. Those in Proctors Way generally follow the contours of the roof (such as solar panels). Those elsewhere I have no detailed knowledge of but some appear to have been an integral part of a design rather than a later extension. In any event I
-

must make my determination on the basis of the particular circumstances in this case. The examples provided do not, therefore, add weight to the Appellant's case.

6. The development plan includes the East Herts Local Plan Second Review of 2007. Saved Policies ENV1 and ENV5, taken together, seek to ensure that all development is of a high standard of design and compatible with the character and appearance of surrounding buildings and townscape. Under the terms of Policy ENV6 roof dormers are only deemed to be acceptable where they are appropriate to the design and character of the original dwelling and its surroundings, and when not so large as to dominate the roof. In my judgement the proposed front dormer would be in conflict with these policies because of its location, mass, shape and size. It would dominate the front roof slope of the dwelling.
7. I understand the reasons for wishing to extend the house in order to improve the available accommodation for the Appellant's family, but I find that this matter is outweighed by the harm I have identified.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Major

INSPECTOR