
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by Matthew Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/19/3232630

Whiskers, South End, Perry Green, SG10 6EP

- 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 P Matthews against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/0293/HH, dated 12 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is front dormer with flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front dormer with flat roof at Whiskers, South End, Perry Green, SG10 6EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/19/0293/HH, dated 12 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1929-PL10, 1929-PL10A, 1929-PL11, 1929-PL11A, 1929-PL12.

Procedural Matters

2. I observed on my site visit that development had already been carried out and, apart from the absence of a balcony panel which appears on the submitted plans, the development appears to generally accord with the submitted plans, against which I am considering this appeal.
3. The Council have raised that some works to the existing property are not authorised. However, I have been provided with limited detail of the Council's concerns and in any event, those matters are not part of the development for which permission is sought in the appeal. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the development applied for detailed on the plans submitted and any other development, whether authorised or not, is a separate matter between the Council and the appellant in the first instance.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling located behind a small hardstanding area. Properties on the street differ in terms of their size, layout

and design and are unevenly distributed along its length. They are generally set in spacious plots with varying degrees of set back from the road.

6. The overall roof form of the appeal dwelling is rather unusual, but the flat roof of the dormer is situated centrally within the front roof slope in between, and set some distance behind, two front facing gable roof elements. It is also positioned below the ridge line of a roof slope which is situated behind the dormer. It sits comfortably between roof slopes without undermining the presence of the prominent gables, or overwhelming the host dwelling. I understand that previous permissions¹ allowed significant alterations to the original dwelling. However, the inclusion of a flat roof dormer in this case does not disrupt the symmetry of the dwelling, either in comparison with the original dwelling, or the altered dwelling, and whilst I did not see any other examples of similar flat roof designs or front facing balconies on the street on my site visit, the design and appearance of it does not appear out of kilter with the notably varied house types in the area.
7. The separation between individual plots and the verdant appearance of the street means that there are limited views of the appeal dwelling in combination with any of the dwellings which sit on either side. The setback position of the dwelling and the subservient nature of the flat roofed dormer further reduces its prominence in the street. Consequently, the development is not harmful to the wider street scene or detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I appreciate that Policy HOU11(C) of the East Herts District Plan October 2018 (the District Plan) precludes flat roofed extensions other than in exceptional circumstances where the character of the original dwelling allows a flat roofed design to be successfully incorporated. However, my foregoing findings concerning the limited impact the development has on the character and appearance of the street and appeal building represents exceptional circumstances in this case.
9. I therefore find that the development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the area. There is no conflict with the general aims of Policies HOU11, VILL3 or DES4 of the District Plan which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure high quality design and layout that reflects the character of the site, the village and its surroundings.

Conditions

10. As the development has already been carried out, it has not been necessary for me to attach the standard time-limit condition. However, I have attached a condition requiring any remaining part of the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of clarity.

Conclusion

11. Having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Matthew Woodward

INSPECTOR

¹ East Hertfordshire District Council planning permission references - 3/16/1503/HH and 3/17/0756/HH