



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/20/3245445

56 Tamworth Road, Hertford, Herts SG13 7DN

- 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 Patrick Shipp against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/19/1897/HH, dated 16 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2019.
 - The development is described as, 'retrospective application for a loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion comprising of rear dormer window and 3 rooflights at 56 Tamworth Road, Hertford, Herts SG13 7DN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/19/1897/HH, dated 16 September 2019, and the drawing numbered TW/19/1/A.

Procedural Matters

2. The loft conversion has been carried out and appears to be in line with the submitted drawings. I have assessed the appeal accordingly.
3. I have used the description of development from the decision notice in my decision above as it is more precise than that stated in the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the host dwelling and Hertford Conservation Area (HCA).

Reasons

5. Tamworth Road is largely characterised by two storey traditional semi-detached and detached dwellings, though there are a number of commercial units opposite the site. The significance of HCA lies in the evidence of historic vernacular architecture which are of a range of ages, forms and materials.
6. No 56 Tamworth Road (No 56) forms part of a pair of semi-detached properties along with No 54 Tamworth Road (No 54). No 54 has a dormer extension above the main part of the house as well as above the outrigger to the rear. While I acknowledge that that extension was constructed prior to the change to the boundary of HCA, it nevertheless forms part of the pair of dwellings and contributes significantly to their character and appearance.

7. The dormer extension subject of this appeal extends over the main part of the house only and is therefore smaller in massing and scale to the roof extensions of No 54. The side of the extension is set in from the flank wall of the host building and while I note the height of the extension, it generally appears subservient to the host building particularly given that it is viewed in the context of the larger extension of the adjacent property.
8. Furthermore, given the location of the property near the varied roofs of Fairfax Road, the extension does not appear incongruous when viewed against the roofscape of the surrounding properties. There are views of the extension from Tamworth Road and Fairfax Road where it is only partially visible or viewed against the adjacent dormer such that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the street scene or HCA. In addition, its cladding is in keeping with the materials of the host building, adjacent extension and surrounding roofs.
9. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a statutory duty upon me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Given my findings above that the proposal would reflect the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part and the area in general; I conclude that the development preserves the character or appearance of the host dwelling and HCA.
10. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policies HA1, HA4 of the adopted East Herts District Plan (2018) (DP) which together require extensions to buildings in conservation areas to preserve or enhance the historic environment, special interest, character and appearance of the area. It would also not conflict with DP Policies DES4 and HOU11(d) which among other things require developments to respect the character of the site and surrounding area and that dormers should not dominate the existing roof form. The proposal would sustain the significance of the conservation area as a heritage asset, as required by paragraph 185 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

11. While I note the conditions suggested by the Council, since the development has taken place, the standard time related condition and the condition relating to materials are not necessary. A condition specifying plans has also been suggested, however, given that my formal decision links the permission to the approved plan, that condition is unnecessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR