



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2019

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/19/3230083

60 Station Road, Puckeridge SG11 1TF

- 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 Richard Millward against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/0467/HH, dated 3 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a dormer extension and associated changes to form an additional bedroom with an en-suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has questioned whether the side extension is required to be included in the planning permission refused by the Council. However, regardless of this issue, my decision is based on the proposal for a dormer extension as applied for and described in the planning application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. 60 Station Road is an extended semi-detached house located in a part of the street made up of similar dwellings of the same age and design. Although the existing first floor side and rear extensions are substantial, they are well considered in their design and do not appear as overly bulky, sitting comfortably within the context of the existing house and local area.
5. Notwithstanding that the proposed first floor dormer extension would appear to be within permitted development rights parameters for such extensions under the General Permitted Development Order, the addition of this extension would, in combination with the proposed change from hip to gable roof form and other roof profile variations, appear confusing and visually jarring. This would have the effect of fundamentally altering the character and appearance of the building.
6. Due to its bulk and excessive scale in relation to the host building the proposed first floor dormer extension and gable roof form would, due to space between

semidetached pairs and the curve of the street, be prominent in both public and private views of the rear of the property. In these views the proposal would, due to its scale and resulting confusing roof form, fail to appear as a subservient addition to the existing property, thus detracting from its character and appearance and that of the surrounding area.

7. The proposed dormer extension and gable roof form and other associated variations to the roof form would appear disproportionate and overly dominant in the context of the host building. The gable roof form would also be out of keeping and incongruous with the roof forms of semi-detached pairs of houses that provide the local context and setting for the appeal property.
8. Consequently, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area and be contrary to Policies HOU11 and DES4 of the East Herts District Plan 2018, which seek to ensure a high quality of design in development that reflects and promotes local distinctiveness, that extensions are subservient additions to the host dwelling and that dormers do not dominate the existing roof form.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR