



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020

by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1915/D/3253941

50 Abbots Way, Bishops Stortford, Herts CM23 4JF

- 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 Mrs Sharon Coaker against the decision of East Hertfordshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 3/20/0495/HH, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is front two storey extension and single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front two storey extension and single storey extension at 50 Abbots Way, Bishops Stortford, Herts CM23 4JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/20/0495/HH, dated 4 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Existing Plans & Elevations Drawing No D200202/1; and Proposed Extension & Alterations Drawing No D200202/2 A.
 - 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with attached garage. It has a two storey gable projection positioned to one side of the front elevation. There is an unusually large expanse of brickwork between that projection and the only ground floor window in this elevation. The property is located in a mature well-established residential area, between other properties at the end of a cul de sac. The area is typically characterised by closely spaced, detached properties of varied design. Two storey front gables and single storey front projections of varied design and scale are predominant features in the street scene.

4. The proposal would entail the construction of a part two storey and part single storey extension that would project out by approximately 2.4 metres from the front of the property. The new gable would sit centrally within the front elevation, alongside, but forward of the existing gable. The gable extension would sit down from the main ridge line, matching the existing gable in height and pitch. The single storey mono pitched element would sit below and forward of the existing gable.
5. The appeal property has a generous plot frontage relative to neighbouring properties. As such the dwelling is set back from the road and does not appear prominent in the street scene. This set back position would ensure that the proposed development would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property or adjacent properties. The use of matching materials, fenestration and the roof design would ensure that the proposal would sit comfortably against the existing two storey gable. Its staggered form and overall scale would allow the proposal to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the original dwelling.
6. Although twin gables on property frontages are not part of the current street scene, because of the wide variety of both single storey and two storey front projections, the introduction of an additional frontage gable at the appeal site would not be so alien as to cause unacceptable harm to the street scene. The existing front elevation presents a somewhat irregular solid to void ratio; I consider that the design of the extension would result in a balanced and positive addition to the host property.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the street scene. It would be consistent with Policies DES4 and HOU11 of the East Herts District Plan 2018, which together, and amongst other matters, require a high standard of design and extensions to be of a size, scale, mass, form, siting and design that are appropriate to the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. I also find the proposals to be in general conformity with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of achieving well designed places.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested conditions that it considers would be appropriate. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the area, I have imposed a condition requiring matching external materials.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

S Tudhope

Inspector