
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2017

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

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

Decision date: 17 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/16/3164565

10 Carde Close, Hertford SG14 2EU

- 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 & Mrs S & N Eden against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/16/2073/HH, dated 12 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is "removal of existing roof and replaced with first floor extension to create accommodation."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached single storey bungalow located along the northern side of a small cul-de-sac on the north western outskirts of Hertford. The cul-de-sac contains about 18 detached dwellings which are a mixture of single and two storey in size. Some have dormer windows.
 4. The proposal is to remove the existing roof and have a first floor extension resulting in a building which would appear similar to a two storey or chalet style bungalow. There would be two front dormers with pitched roofs in the front elevation of the new roof. The scheme would not increase the footprint of the existing bungalow, however, the Council are concerned that the eaves height would increase and that the bulk and massing of the proposal would harm the existing dwelling and the area.
 5. Having considered this carefully, I take the view that proposal would result in an overly bulky building given its plot size and the proximity of neighbouring dwellings. The appearance of the host dwelling would be harmed. As the dwelling is part of a short row of closely-situated and similar dwellings, I consider it is important to keep the eaves heights at similar levels and I have noted the success of the scheme at no.6 Carde Close which has provided first
-

floor accommodation. The proposal in this case, at no.10, would in my view result in a building that was too prominent and incongruous given the scale and size of its neighbouring dwellings. I consider that the rhythm of the row of dwellings would not be adequately maintained.

6. I conclude therefore that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would not accord with policies ENV5, ENV1 or ENV6 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review 2007.

Other Matters

7. Given the locations and orientations of walls and windows, I do not consider that the living conditions of the occupants of nearby dwellings would be harmed with regard to privacy, outlook, light or otherwise.

Conclusion

8. Having taken into account all relevant representations made, for the above reasons, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR