

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/17/3175479

25 Wychford Drive, Sawbridgeworth, Herts, CM20 0HA

- 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 Josh Haley against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/17/0320/HH dated 8 February 2017 was refused by notice dated 6 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the removal of up and over gabled porch roof, minor extension to front porch and replacement roof with a hipped front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on Wychford Drive, close to the end of one branch of the cul-de-sac. The area is predominantly residential with most of the buildings consisting of detached and semi-detached dwellings. Some of the properties have gable fronts and others with a pitched roof form with gables to the side, although the generally simple form and the close spacing between the properties contributes to the pleasant, close-knit character of the area.
4. Both the appellant and the Council make reference to previous appeal decisions¹ that were dismissed, albeit with variations to the Enforcement Notice. I have been provided with some details of the development that was subject of those appeals and was also able to see the gable fronted porch with its overhang at the time of my visit. The current proposal seeks an amended porch to what was considered previously, which would include a hipped roof form.
5. I appreciate that the revisions to the roof form, which include the removal of the overhang, would reduce the size and bulk of the porch. However, the

¹ APP/J1915/C/16/3155055 and APP/J1915/C/16/3167548

hipped roof form would not be in keeping with the predominant flat roof form of front projections in the area. I have been provided with examples of flat roof's that have been altered to form pitched roofs, some with hipped sides and other alterations. I am not however aware of the full circumstances of these referenced cases and in any case, at the time of my visit and from my site observations, I was able to see that the predominant roof form of front projections in the area comprise of flat roofs.

6. The Council's refusal related to the roof form and not to other elements of the development and I have no reason to disagree with this position. However, given the proposed roof form of the porch, which would be clearly seen in the streetscene given the forward positioning of the appeal property in relation to the neighbouring dwelling to the south, it would nevertheless have a harmful visual effect on the character of the area for reasons set out above.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies ENV1, ENV5 and ENV6 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review, which seek, amongst other matters, a high standard of design and development that reflects local distinctiveness. It would also conflict with Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. I note the planning history of the appeal property and more specifically the mono-pitch roof design of a previously approved porch. I can however confirm that, irrespective of earlier decisions, I have considered the appeal application on its own merits.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR