

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: 31 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/17/3175542

39 Fanshawe Street, Bengeo, Hertford, SG14 3AT

- 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 Matt Jarvis against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/17/0352/HH dated 12 February 2017 was refused by notice dated 7 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension and alterations to roof including raising roof height to create second floor accommodation with three rear dormers and two front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension and alterations to roof including raising roof height to create second floor accommodation with three rear dormers and two front rooflights at 39 Fanshawe Street, Bengeo, Hertford, SG14 3AT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 3/17/0352/HH dated 12 February 2017 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P.001 (Location Plan and Existing & Proposed Site Plan), P.003 Revision B (Existing & Proposed Plans), P.004 Revision B (Existing & Proposed Elevations), P.005 Revision B (Existing & Proposed 3D Views), P.006 Revision A (Photo Montage View from Bean Road) and P.007 Revision A (Photo Montage View from Fanshawe Street).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have utilised the description of development used by the Council in the decision notice, and by the appellant in subsequent submissions including the appeal form. This more accurately describes the proposal as it includes reference to a first-floor rear extension.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the area and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling which is situated on the south-western side of Fanshawe Street, within the Hertford Conservation Area. The area contains a variety of housing with detached, semi-detached and terraced properties all evident along the street. These appear to date mainly from the late 19th and early 20th Century, although more modern buildings, such as the appeal property are also present. Despite the variance in built form and the height of buildings, the houses are set on generally consistent building lines, although those on the appeal property's side of the street, are set back further from Fanshawe Street than those on the opposite side. Many of the properties have good quality detailing around entrance doors, bay windows and incorporate other traditional features which contribute to the special character of the Conservation Area.
5. The proposal seeks permission for a rear extension and alterations to the roof which would see an increase in its height and would also include three rear dormers. The development would see the overall height of the appeal dwelling being similar to No.'s 33-37 Fanshawe Street. It would however result in a larger difference in height between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling to the north-west, No. 41 Fanshawe Street. I acknowledge that at present, the appeal property offers somewhat of a 'step down' between the taller dwellings at No's 33-37 and No. 41. However, given that difference in the style and form between these neighbouring properties, I do not consider that the increased height of the appeal dwelling, even when taking into account its width, would appear pronounced in the streetscene.
6. To the rear, the appeal proposal would result in a shorter roof slope within which would be sited three dormers. These would, as the Council state, appear higher than the existing dormers. I do not however consider that this siting would necessarily be harmful given the size of the two small dormers and that they would be set in from the edges of the roof. I recognise that the central dormer would be of a larger scale but it would still be largely contained within the existing roofslope, with all three dormers adopting a pitched roof form. The rear of the dwelling is prominent in wider views but given the large area of glazing proposed to the rear, including on the dormers, I do not agree with the Council that these elements of the proposal would have a top-heavy appearance. Rather, they would sit comfortably alongside No. 37, which has a contemporary appearance in the rear streetscene.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would also preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I therefore find that there would be no conflict with Policies ENV1, ENV5, ENV6, BH5 or BH6 of the East Herts Local Plan Second Review, which seek, amongst other matters, a high standard of design and proposals to be

sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. There would also be no conflict with Sections 7 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having taken into account all other matters raised, including reference to a previous application at the site, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I consider the standard implementation condition and a condition for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to be necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will impose a condition in relation to materials to match the existing in the interests of the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR