
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by J Dowling BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1905/D/17/3168390

Beaumont Manor Farm, Beaumont Road, Wormley EN10 7QJ

- 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 A Norris against the decision of Broxbourne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 07/16/1044/HF, dated 7 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is extensions to existing detached house. Including renewal of garage roof, rebuilding ground floor bay windows, inglenook fireplace, first floor bathroom extension and new entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. This appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extensions to existing detached house. Including renewal of garage roof, rebuilding ground floor bay windows, inglenook fireplace, first floor bathroom extension and new entrance porch at Beaumont Manor Farm, Beaumont Road, Wormley EN10 7QJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 07/16/1044/HF, dated 15 November 2016 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Prior to the construction of the extensions details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings: Location plan, 16/12 rev C, 16/13, 16/14, 16/15 and 16/16.

Procedural Matter

2. Two sets of proposed plans, which show materially different schemes, were submitted with the appeal. Set 1 consisted of plan Nos 16/12 rev A, 16/13 rev A, 16/14 rev A, 16/15 rev A and 16/16 rev A and set 2 consisted of plan Nos 16/12 rev C, 16/13, 16/14, 16/15 and 16/16. Set 1 appeared to relate to the description of development on the application form and decision notice in that it included reference to a front dormer window but an extract from set 2 appeared in the appeal statement¹. The plans listed on the decision notice were 16/12, 16/13, 16/14, 16/15 and 16/16. In order to clarify which plans

¹ Paragraph 4.16

formed the basis of the appeal the appellant and the Council were contacted and requested to confirm which plans had been submitted with the planning application and were the subject of the appeal.

3. In response the Council provided the plans that they had considered when they determined the planning application which were the same as set 2. The appellant provided a set of plans which showed a third alternative scheme where the proposed side extension would have a pyramidal roof.
4. On the basis that the plans provided by the Council have been confirmed by them as being the ones they considered and which are also referred to in the appeal statement it is this set that I have used when determining the appeal.
5. Although both the application form and the decision notice refer to a new front dormer such a feature is not shown on the plans as a result I have amended the description of development in the banner heading to omit this detail.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

7. Beaumont Road is a rural road which is characterised by sporadic development. I note from my site visit that whilst there is no typical architectural style for properties along the road, most are characterised by being set back from the road with front gardens, hedges and areas of soft landscaping which contribute to the rural character of the area. Beaumont Manor Farm is a substantial detached house on a spacious plot with a mature evergreen hedge along the front boundary. It forms part of a small cluster of properties around the junction with Bread and Butter Lane.
8. The property has an existing large single storey attached garage, the proposed first floor extension would be set into part of the existing garage roof. The proposed extension would have a subordinate pitched roof which has been designed to reflect the pitch of the existing roof forms at the property. This combined with the set back from the front elevation would minimise the bulk and mass of the extension and enable the extension to integrate with the original dwelling. Although there would be a lack of windows in the front elevation, given the set back; relatively limited depth and length of the front façade and the screening provided by the front boundary treatment I consider that the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the host property.
9. The proposed first floor extension would include a large picture window in the rear elevation. Whilst the proposed window does not reflect the scale or design of other windows within the property given it's location within the rear façade views of this window from the surrounding area would be very limited and as a consequence given that the property is not listed nor in a conservation area I consider that any harm to the character and appearance of the host property would not be sufficient to warrant dismissing the appeal.
10. The Council have raised concerns that the proposed extension would adversely affect the symmetry of the building. However, I observed on site that due to

the large single storey garage the building currently does not have a symmetrical appearance.

11. The proposal also includes a number of other elements including rebuilding the ground floor bay windows; construction of a porch and creation of an inglenook fireplace and associated chimney. The Council do not appear to have objected to these elements of the scheme and from what I observed on site they have been designed to reflect and respect the design of the original house.
12. As a result I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and as a consequence would be in accordance with policy H8 of the Borough of Broxbourne Local Plan (second review) 2011-2021 (2005). The policy requires that development should comply with the design advice contained within the Borough-wide Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 (updated 2013) which advocates that extensions should be designed to complement the parent building and be visually integrated with it. This policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that development should be of a high quality of design.

Conditions

13. Paragraph 206 of the Framework sets out a number of tests that conditions need to meet. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the Framework and judge that they meet these tests. In addition to the standard time limit, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of clarity, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
14. The Council have suggested that a condition requiring details of the external facing and roofing materials should be attached in order to secure a satisfactory external appearance. Although the proposed materials are detailed on the application form and shown on the plans I noted on my site visit that extensive building work has already commenced on site including the replacement of windows with coloured frames which differ from the information detailed on the application form. As a consequence there would appear to be some uncertainty over the proposed materials and as a result I consider that it would be reasonable, in order to provide clarity, to impose a condition requiring the materials to be approved. However, given that work has commenced on site I have amended the wording of the condition accordingly.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR