
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2017

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/W/16/3164347

26 and 28 Parker Avenue, Bengoe, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 3LA

- 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 and Mrs Eddleston and Mr and Mrs Jackson against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/16/1638/HH, dated 19 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is two-storey rear extensions and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two-storey rear extensions and internal alterations at 26 and 28 Parker Avenue, Bengoe, Hertford, Hertfordshire SG14 3LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/16/1638/HH, dated 19 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 12545-P002, 12545-P001-A, 12545-S001-A, 12458-P002-A, 12458-S001-A, 12458-P001-B.
 - 3) The extension to No 26 hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows at on the second floor bathroom window has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed extensions at No 28 Parker Avenue on the character and appearance of that property.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to two-storey extensions to the rear of a semi-detached pair of houses, where the neighbours have teamed up to provide additions which would line up flush with each other at the rear. The dwellings are within a street of similar local authority-built, hipped-roofed semi-detached houses,
-

spaciously arranged to a common pattern with small front gardens. Being at the rear, these proposals would not harm the pleasing architectural homogeneity of the street scene.

4. The extension to No 26 would be a simple hipped-roof rear addition, whereas that to No 28 would have to work around an existing dormer and two-storey rear and side extension. This necessitates a more complex roof design for the wider addition, involving an area of crown roof. This addition would be visible from some neighbouring properties but have little material impact on the character and appearance of the wider area. Although the nature of the crown roof design at No 28 would not be ideal in every situation, in this case it would not be visually prominent and the harm caused to that of the host building would be quite limited.
5. Consequently the additions to No 28 would not give rise to any material degree of conflict with the aims of Policies ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review 2007, or with those of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions and conclusion

6. I have had regard to the conditions that have been suggested by the Council. Where necessary, and in the interests of conciseness and enforceability, I have altered these to better reflect the relevant parts of the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard condition limiting the life of the permission, it is necessary in the interests of certainty that a condition sets out the plans approved. In the interests of the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers at No 24 a condition also requires the second floor bathroom window at No 26 to be obscure glazed and high opening and retained as such. Subject to these conditions, and for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR